THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors." (Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXII.—APRIL, 1907—No. 126

SAINT FRANCIS AND BUDDHA.

A COMPARATIVE study of St. Francis and Buddha, strange as it may appear at first, is amply justified by the fact that frequent assertions are made, in the ever-increasing Franciscan literature, of a similarity between these two religious reformers and the movements which they have created.

Cesare Cantù, in his "Gli eretici d' Italia,"[1] published in 1866, alluded to a probable influence of Buddhism on Christianity, particularly at the time of the Crusades, when the order of the Templars was founded and St. Francis appeared, "in whom we find so many points of contact with the solitaries of India."

Ernest Renan's "Nouvelles études religieuses," which appeared in 1884, contain two essays on Buddhism and one on St. Francis. The study of these two great movements and of their authors naturally brought to his mind the idea of a comparison, which he expresses in several passages.[2]

After Renan many authors, mostly non-Catholic, have compared Buddha and Francis. Perhaps the most prominent among these are A. Kuenen, professor at Leiden,[3] and Henry Thode.[4] Since many subsequent writers on Franciscan matters have largely repro-

[1] Three vols. Turin, 1866, Vol. I., Diss. vi.

[2] Paris, 1884, pp. 161, 326, 330.

[3] Cf. "The Hibbert Lectures, 1882;" "National Religions and Universal Religions," Berlin, London, 1882; Lecture V., "Buddhism," pp. 271-275.

[4] "Franz von Assisi ünd die Anfänge der Kunst der Renaissance in Italien," Berlin, 1885, pp. 59-60, 66.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1907, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

duced the ideas of Thode, or, at least, have met on the same ground, the following quotation from him seems appropriate, as expressing the main trend of thought on the subject in non-Catholic Franciscan literature:

"Buddha and Francis! Both arose to oppose a religion reduced to mere formulas and to a spirit of caste; both, impressed by the awful forebodings of death, renounced a life of pleasure and sensuality; to both absolute poverty appeared as the means of freedom from all things earthly. Both attained a depth of spiritual insight which led them to absolute control over the body. . . . Both had a community of homeless, wandering monks, who spread their doctrines through the country and soon seemed to fill the world.

"And yet what an immense difference! One, according to what we may conjecture, was a thinker, who sought in himself the eternal laws of a self-existing, self-governing universe; the other, a poet, who, leaving as it were his own self, hailed the eternal ideal of a God-man, Creator and Preserver of the world. For both the real world disappears; but one breaks away from it only to centre all his powers on his own self; the other joins his destiny with that of the world, yet soars above it. Of Buddha under the tree of knowledge, nothing at last remains but thinking; of Francis on Mount Alverna, nothing remains but feeling. The consequences have been that the spiritual achievements of Buddha, though the possession of only a privileged minority, yet have exercised an influence on thousands of years; while, on the contrary, the ideals of Francis, at first the property of the people, were, after a few centuries, supplanted by other ideals more progressive than his. As far as the originality and significance of the thought are concerned, Francis could hardly compare with the Indian religious founder."

Professor John Herkless, in his "Francis and Dominic and the Mendicant Orders,"[5] reproduces almost textually these words of Thode, though he does not go so far as to make Buddha superior to Francis. Raffaele Mariano, in his excellent work, "Francesco d'Assisi e alcuni dei suoi più recenti biografi,"[6] highly proclaims the superiority of Francis, but maintains the comparison, and draws an interesting parallel between the Third Order and the lay Buddhistic communities. The first chapter of Miss Anna Stoddart's "Francis of Assisi"[7] brings out cleverly some points of contact between the Oriental and the Franciscan religious movements.

At a time when the Oriental religions, the reform movements of all ages and all countries and the psychology of reformers are

[5] New York, 1901, pp. 79-80.
[6] Napoli, 1896, pp. 153, 192-193.
[7] London, 1903, pp. 1-12.

favorite studies such comparison cannot fail to be rich in suggestions, and it would be interesting to see how far it might be carried.

Nor is there anything derogatory to the character of St. Francis in the fact of joining his name to that of Buddha. The personality of the latter contains many a trait which would be an object of admiration in a Christian saint; this is so true that a Syrian monk of the seventh century presented him in a Christian garb as the hero of a novel entitled "Barlaam and Josaphat," and so saintly did he appear to Christian admirers that he passed into the Roman martyrology under the name of St. Josaphat, his feast being celebrated on the 27th of November with that of St. Barlaam.[8]

I.

The circumstances amidst which Buddha came on the world's stage were not unlike those in which St. Francis arose, and we may already find many points of resemblance in the conditions which made their reform necessary. Both were representative men; they were the product and the image of their time; they incarnated the ideas, the spirit and aspirations of their contemporaries, and in this we must see largely the secret of their success.

Buddha, or rather Gotama the Buddha, as we should call him, for "Buddha" is a common noun, is generally looked upon as the reformer of Brahmanism, a religion which had done good in its time, but had lost much of its former influence and efficacy. The spirit of caste distinction had invaded it, and the four classes—Brahman priests, Kshatryas or warriors, Vaisyas or farmers and Sudras or conquered natives—much remind one of the four classes which divided society in the Middle Ages—the clergy and monks, the lords, the serfs and the slaves. The slaves had disappeared from Italy by the time of St. Francis, but a new class, that of the merchants, had arisen, which was becoming more and more powerful and had taken its position as a middle class between the lords and the serfs. Both Buddha and Francis belonged to one of the middle classes. According to some, Buddha was the son of a prince of North India, while other recent Orientalists hold that his father was a wealthy landowner. Francis was the son of a merchant.

In India at the time of Buddha, as in Italy at the time of Francis, the wealth and power of the few were used as a means to oppress and crush the poor and little; hence tyranny and pride on one side,

[8] F. Max Muller, "Chips From a German Workshop," New York, 1887, pp. 177-180; "Annales du Musée Guimet," Vol. XIX., pp. 43-50; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1890, pp. 119-121; "Revue des Questions Historiques," Vol. XXVIII. (1880), pp. 579-600; H. Delahaye, S. J., "Les legendes hagiographiques," Bruxelles, 1905, p. 72.

envy and revolt on the other. As the Brahmans considered themselves superior to all by their birth, their position, their wealth, so also the lords of the Middle Ages and at times some less apostolic members of the clergy and the monastic state, held aloof from the rest of the people, whom they considered inferior to them and hardly worthy of their compassion. Our two religious reformers came to teach their contemporaries that true greatness is not proportioned to rank and honors, but to virtue, and that true happiness does not consist in wealth and worldly pleasures, but in the peace of mind which is in the reach of all.

Again, the Hindoos of Buddha's time shared largely the characteristics of the youthful people of the Middle Ages. Like them they knew no measure in their conduct for good or for evil; they were equally attracted by great pleasures and by extreme asceticism. The austere life of the solitaries captivated the Hindoo heart not less than the most luxurious enjoyments. Buddha as well as Francis changed brigands into saints. The people of these two epochs of history were not theologians, and they were struck by the sight of these poor monks, by their simple sympathetic preaching much more than by the philosophy which lay at the base of their practices.

We have no contemporary record of Buddha's life. From what we may conjecture, he lived from 622 to 542 B. C. As in the case of St. Francis, it was announced from his earliest years that he would be a great man. Yet the efforts of his father to bring him up in comfort and dignity, according to his rank, could not check his natural melancholy. The older he grew the more intense became this melancholy, increased as it was by his tender sympathy for so many around him who suffered from the numerous ills which afflict mankind. All possible distractions were tried in vain. Shortly after his marriage he decided to flee the false joys of this world. Old age, sickness, death overbalanced all that the world could offer to its votaries. The calmness alone of the monk attracted him; but his father refused to let him embrace the life of a hermit. At twenty-nine he left the palace secretly, cut his hair with his sword, exchanged his rich garments for a hunter's rough brown habit and began to go from school to school, hoping to find in the teaching of masters the happiness that he was seeking. Disappointed again, he went to a desert where, with five disciples, he gave himself up to a life of incredible austerity. But after six years, emaciated and having failed to find in mortification the happiness for which all human hearts crave, he gave up the practice of extreme mortification, losing by this act his five disciples. He made up his mind that happiness consists in a middle way between worldly pleasures and extreme asceticism. "There are two extremes," he said to his dis-

ciples, "which he who has given up the world ought to avoid, . . . a life given to pleasure . . . this is degrading, sensual, vulgar, ignoble and profitless; and a life given to mortification; this is painful, ignoble and profitless."[9] It was, however, through meditation, through ecstasy that the final secret to all happiness, the supreme truth, the "Bodhi," could be found. Sitting under a tree motionless at Bodhgaya with his legs crossed, he resolved to remain in this position until he found the Bohdi. Mara, the seducer, attacked him by all forms of temptations, but he resisted them all and finally found the Bodhi and became a Buddha. He had then reached the age of thirty-five.

Before Francis was thirty-five his movement had already spread all over Italy and part of Europe.[10] Yet if we consider the facts that led to the reform life of these two men, it may be seen from the preceding sketch that there are striking points of resemblance. To Francis also were offered the best opportunities in life. True, he spent some happy years in his youth; but he, too, experienced the most touching sympathy for the poor and the suffering. Neither the comforts of home nor the amusements and distractions which his friends and admirers lavished on him, nor even the adventures of warfare, of which he had so often dreamed, could now satisfy his heart, and he soon became disgusted with all that wealth and the world could offer him. Like Buddha, he left the world and exchanged his costly garments for the habit of a farm-hand. He then betook himself to a life of mortification and asceticism until one day, when he was hearing Mass in the little chapel of the Portiuncula, he was struck by the words of the Gospel of St. Matthew:[11] "Do not possess gold nor silver, nor money in your purses, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff." Like Buddha in ecstasy under the Bodhi tree, he had now found his ideal.

From these turning epochs in their lives the points of resemblance become more and more striking. Both went forth full of enthusiasm, convinced that they were then in possession of the secret of true happiness. It is true some doubt came to their minds as to whether they should keep to themselves the knowledge won and lead the life of contemplatives, or share this knowledge with others and consecrate themselves to an active life. Disinterestedness and sympathy for others had the greater weight in the scale, and both went and proclaimed to all the truth which they had found. "Being delivered, deliver others; having arrived at the other shore, bring

[9] Mahâwagaa I., 6, 17, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XIII., p. 94.

[10] Jac. Vitr. Epist. I., Jan., 1216, in H. Boehmer's "Analecten zur Gesch. des Franc. v. Ass.," Tubingen, 1904, pp. 98-99; N. Glassberger in "Analecta Franciscana," Vol. III., pp. 9-10.

[11] Mat. x., 9, 10.

the others there; being consoled, console others; having attained perfect Nirvana, bring others there,"[12] was Buddha's maxim, and St. Francis reminded his disciples that "God had called them not only for their own salvation, but for that of many."[13] Buddha converted to his ideal the five disciples who had spurned him after his flight from the desert, and Francis saw flock to his standard of poverty those who had turned him into derision.

Much has been said about Buddha's "Bhikkhus," that is, beggars or mendicant monks, who, like the first Franciscans, practiced absolute poverty and preached detachment from the goods of this world. They should not inflict on themselves voluntary sufferings, which Buddha proclaimed dangerous, but should avoid all that attaches to this life and existence. Hence they could not possess anything except a set of clothes composed of three pieces, nor receive anything except the food begged for the day. They could not marry and were forbidden to converse alone with women. When out on a mission or on their daily begging tour they were to be extremely modest and to watch carefully over their eyes. In the beginning their dwellings were very simple, consisting of little huts under the trees. Even these they occupied only during the rainy season; at other times they roamed about from place to place. Later they received from benefactors more substantial, yet plain, convent houses, which were generally located on the outskirts of towns, where they could beg and preach. Their time was divided between begging, preaching and praying. They begged in the morning, took their only meal at noon and spent the rest of the day in preaching, teaching children, meditation or holy conversations on Buddha's doctrine. They considered preaching and the teaching of children a fair return for the alms they received. The public confession of external faults was as regular among them as it is in the Franciscan and other monastic orders. There was no discrimination in the reception of candidates, no regard to castes. With Brahmanists, only members of the sacerdotal caste could be monks; it was a distinction from birth. But now the contemptible Sudra as well as the noble Brahman was received into the brotherhood, and all lived like brothers. "My law is a law of grace for all," said Buddha; "it is the law under which beggars as miserable as Durâgata and others may become religious."[14]

The success of Buddha was wonderful. The purity of his life, his simplicity of manners, his love for all, particularly those who

[12] E. Burnouf, "Introduction à l'histoire du Buddhisme Indien," Vol. I., Paris, 1844, p. 254.

[13] III. Soc., 36.

[14] E. Burnouf, "Introduction à l'histoire du Buddhisme Indien," Paris, 1844, Vol. I., p. 198.

suffered, attracted all to him. When he returned to his native place all wanted to follow him; women were abandoned by their husbands, sisters by their brothers, mothers by their sons. He was soon forced to limit to one in each family the number of those who could join the new confraternity.

Necessity also compelled him to found an order for women, for they, too, wished to give up home, family, riches, pleasures to join the society of the perfect and lead a life of solitude, abstinence, chastity and obedience. They lived in convents built in the vicinity of those of the monks, but entirely separated from them. No monk was allowed to travel with a nun, and only one especially appointed for that purpose could preach to them. They also lived on alms and spent in retirement and meditation the time not given to begging.

Finally a class of lay adherents was organized to satisfy the universal demand, and into it flocked many who, for some reason or other, were unable to leave the world, but yet wished to participate in the privileges of Buddha's disciples. In this Third Order, as we may well call it, both sexes were admitted. The main duties of the members, beside that of supporting the monks and assisting them in their life, were: to observe chastity according to their state of life, to avoid stealing and lying, the use of intoxicating liquors and the taking of life, even that of animals.

Any one acquainted with the life of St. Francis will have noticed the close parallel between him and Buddha. Not more than Buddha did Francis believe in extreme asceticism. Though his companions, like those of Buddha, had to observe certain fasts, they were allowed to "eat of all foods which were placed before them, according to the Gospel,[15] and when, during his trip to the Holy Land, Francis heard of the introduction of new fast days by some over-zealous disciples, he repeated emphatically: "Let us eat what is placed before us, according to the Gospel."[16] Francis and his disciples "were satisfied with a single tunic, often patched up inside and outside, with a cord and breeches."[17] The rule was a little more generous, allowing them two tunics. The regulations respecting chastity and their conduct towards women, particularly the members of the Second Order, were very much like those stated above for the Bhikkhus. Before joining the order they were required to give up all their goods, nor could they own anything, either in private or in common; the very houses in which they lived were the property of others. In fact, in the beginning they went from place to place, having no home but the broad expanse of heaven and the little huts or public

[17] Cel. I., 39, Testam.

[15] First Rule, chap. iii.

[16] N. Glassberger in "Anal. Franc," II., p. 16.

hospitals which they found on the country roads. Later they received permanent abodes; but these also were poor, and remained the property of others. The little church of the Portiuncula, the mother house of the order, belonged to the Benedictines of Mount Subasio. When the labor of their hands did not suffice to support the community, they would go out and beg what was necessary to satisfy their immediate wants, giving in return to their benefactors the spiritual bread of the word of God, which they dispensed generously to all. The time not consecrated to begging, working and preaching was given to the sweets of contemplation, which Francis, like Buddha, relished so much that he long hesitated between an active and a contemplative life. All were accepted into the order—lords and serfs, rich and poor, great and little, learned and ignorant. There was no distinction of castes and conditions; the poor Giles, John the Simple, the foolish Juniper, farm hands and brigands were welcomed into the order with the same joy as priests like Silvester and Leo, as the wealthy Bernard of Quintavalle, the noble Rufino, the Knight Angelo Tancredi, the lawyer Peter of Catania, the learned Thomas of Celano, or the poet laureate Pacifico. Like Buddha, Francis never thought of abolishing the existing conditions and the differences of classes in society; there was no revolutionary spirit in these two men; their reform did not aim at any political subversion, but merely at the change of individuals; classes and distinctions were of no importance in their orders, and virtue was the only title to greatness. Francis insisted that respect be shown to those of the higher classes in society; but the example of equality in the orders should act as an antidote both against the arrogance of the rich and powerful and the envy of the poor and little.

Both Buddha and Francis merit our admiration for having taught man the proper harmony of his faculties. Reason, not sense, must be the dominant power, and the body must be under the control of the will. Yet, though the pleasures of the senses lost in their eyes the value which they have for most men, they always preserved a remarkably sensitive soul. They sought souls, not bodies; yet they did not neglect the care of the body. As the Buddhist monk carried around his medicine box and administered to sufferers all the comforts in his power, so Francis and his companions would go to the lazar house and wash and dress the lepers' wounds. In fact, they loved everything endowed with life. Buddhist monks would watch attentively where they put their feet, lest they might destroy or injure some living insect or reptile, while Francis would save from death the poor sheep led to the shambles or the fish given him for his repast, or even the wolf of the Fioretti, which had been the terror of Gubbio.

When Buddha was asked to extend the privileges of his order to women and later to lay people, his sympathetic nature could not resist the appeal and, as a result, he organized a second and a third order. So also Francis could not send away Clara of Sciffi nor all the holy virgins who after her wished to consecrate themselves to God under the rule of St. Francis; and when families threatened to go to pieces owing to the number of members who joined the order, Francis was led by necessity to promise them a third order, the members of which could remain in the world while enjoying the privileges of the religious life.

Two elements contributed to the success of Francis and Buddha and to the influence which they exerted on their epoch: on the one hand there were their personal qualities, their love for all, their simplicity, their purity of life, their earnest and enthusiastic desire to do good and make others share in their own personal happiness; but at the same time they brought to the world an ideal which corresponded to the demands and the desires of all. Social unrest was characteristic of the two epochs. A remedy was needed which no one seemed to possess or even to know. Buddha went from master to master hoping to find what he and his contemporaries were so much in need of, but was disappointed until his own efforts brought him to the discovery that desire is the tyrant of man, but that desire can be annihilated and liberty and happiness thereby restored to humanity. In Francis' time the Albigenses, the Waldenses, the Humiliati and many others were offering to the Christian world what they thought would save it from destruction, but with little success, until Francis presented to them the ideal of povery, which captivated all. Both laid their fingers on the root of the trouble and formulated the remedy. It is wealth and worldly pleasures that crush and oppress mankind; fling them away, embrace poverty, despise bodily comforts and seek the comforts of the soul and you will find true happiness and solid joy. It is the multiplicity of desires and the craving for all things lawful and unlawful which overcome man. Destroy the desires by the practice of a poor and simple life, and you will be at rest.

Nor was it an impossible doctrine which they were preaching. Buddha had exchanged the opulence of a princely life for a life of poverty and had found therein the rest which he had long sought. Francis was a promising young merchant before his conversion; he gave up all and found a happiness to which no other might be compared. They were too happy to be selfish, and from the day when their ideals were revealed to them—Buddha under the Bodhi tree, Francis at the Portiuncula—they spent the rest of their lives traveling from town to town to spread everywhere the joyous

tidings. Their eloquence was irresistible; they were so earnest, so much engrossed with their subject, so anxious to have all follow them and be happy. Neither Buddha nor Francis belonged to the "clergy," to the class which so far had monopolized preaching, and their preaching was very different from that heard before them. The Brahmans were proud, pedantic, exclusive. The sermons of St. Francis' time were generally preached in Latin on more or less dogmatic subjects and little understood by the people. But Buddha and Francis were so sincere, so simple, so gentle, so modest, so humble; they made themselves "all to all." Buddha hated nothing more than spiritual pride; it was one of the four sins punished by a prompt dismissal from the order.[18] Francis was the humblest of all men, loved every one and every thing that was humble and little, and insisted on his brethren being called "Minores," and the superiors "Ministri."

They rejoiced at their happy liberation from all that enslaves man, and longed to see others happy. "Let us live happily, then, not hating those who hate us," sang the followers of the Hindoo prophet. "Let us live happily, then, free from ailments among the ailing! Let us live happily, then, free from greed among the greedy! Let us live happily, then, though we can call nothing our own!"[19] and Francis never ceased to inculcate the duty of joy on all his disciples, condemning sadness as unnatural in those who had left the world and all causes of misery and had embraced a life of poverty and holiness. Even insults, temptations, sufferings could not disturb their peace of mind. They would return good for evil and rejoice in sufferings. "Let a man overcome anger by love," we read in the Buddhist Scriptures;[20] "let him overcome evil by good; let him overcome greed by liberality, the liar by truth!" while Francis, when sending his disciples on an apostolic mission, exhorted them in this manner: "You will find some men that are faithful, gentle and kind, who will receive you and your words with joy; others, the greater part, that are faithless, proud and blasphemous, who will revile you and oppose you and your words. Prepare, therefore, your hearts to bear all things patiently and humbly."[21]

It was indeed a beautiful doctrine which they preached and practiced, and the success with which it was received shows what a great ideal can accomplish when announced in word and example by fascinating characters like Buddha and Francis. Perhaps they aimed too high and failed to take into account the awful weakness of human nature. After their death their disciples divided into

[18] Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XIII., p. 5.
[19] Dhammapada, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. X., p. 53.
[20] *Op. Cit.*, p. 58.
[21] III. Soc., 36.

two parties, that of the strict adherents to the rule of life traced by the founder, and the "mitigating" party, whose tendency was to bring the rule to a level more accessible to the majority of men. The division in St. Francis' order occurred soon after his death; the early history of Buddhism is not sufficiently known to fix dates, but we know that the division has remained until this day, and though the Southern Bhikkhus represent only imperfectly the original disciples of Buddha, they stand far above their co-religionists of the North, whose doctrines and practices are rather those of the Brahmans than those of the early Buddhist monks.

II.

What shall we conclude from this parallel? No suspicion can ever arise that the Buddhist movement had any direct influence on the Franciscan. Neither Francis nor his companions thought of Buddha and his great work, nor did they, in all probability, ever hear of it.

Shall we say that there has been an indirect influence through Christianity? It is not the purpose of this short study to enter into a discussion of such a difficult problem as the relations of Buddhism and Christianity. Besides, its solution would lead us only half way, as Christianity offers fey, if any, religious movements presenting such striking points of resemblance with Buddhism.

The question may be simplified. The common features are largely monastic or personal. Some Oriental scholars have thought they could trace monasticism, or at least many of its features, to the Buddhist organization. The possibility of such an influence cannot be denied. After Alexander's conquests and the foundation of Alexandria, communications were established between the East and the West, and the Essenes and Thereapeutae have often been named as the links between the monastic movement of India and that of Christianity. Whatever may be said of Christian monasticism in general, it may be asserted at once that there are some striking resemblances between the Essenes and the Franciscans. Philo and Josephus give us the most interesting details regarding the Essenes:[22] "Some cultivate the soil, others pursue peaceful arts, toiling only for the provision of their necessary wants. . . . Among all men they alone are without money and without possession, but nevertheless they are the richest of all, because to have few wants and live frugally they regard as riches. Among them there is no maker of any weapon of war, nor any trader . . . nor do they follow

[22] Philo, in his treatise, "To prove that every man who is virtuous is also free;" "On the contemplative life," etc. Josephus, "Wars," Book II., chap. viii.; "Antiquities," chap. xvii., xviii., quoted in "Jewish Encyclopedia" article, "Essenes."

any occupation that leads to injustice or covetousness. . . . They distributed their goods to their relatives and friends before joining the order and renounced all conjugal pleasures. There were no masters among them, but all were brethren and served one another. No one possesses a house absolutely his own, one which does not at the same time belong to all. . . . They have one storehouse for all, and the same diet. Their garments belong to all in common, and their meals are taken in common. . . . Whatever they receive for their wages after having worked the whole day, they do not keep as their own, but bring into the common treasure for the use of all. . . . Some of these observe a still more rigid practice in not handling or looking at a coin which has an image." But resemblance does not imply dependence, and from the possibility we cannot conclude to the fact that the Buddhists have had an influence on the Essenes and that the Essenes have exerted an influence on the monastic state of the Occident, in particular on that of St. Francis' stamp.

There is another hypothesis which might perhaps bring us nearer the truth, though again it is only an hypothesis. It is admitted by many that Gnosticism contained a strong element of Buddhism. E. Renan thinks that the Gnosticism of Plotinus was an "emanation from Buddhism,"[23] and J. Kennedy made a strong argument[24] to prove that "the famous scheme of that arch Gnostic (Basilides) was an attempt at fusing Buddhism and Christianity." The relationship between Gnosticism and Manicheism and the influence of the latter on the Cathari and Albigenses of the Middle Ages cannot be denied. But we fall again into an intricate question, though much nearer to our subject—has any influence been exercised on St. Francis by the heretical sects of the Middle Ages? St. Francis' mother was a Provençal, and it is in the South of France that the Albigenses were the strongest. His father was a merchant, and it is through the merchants that many heresies were spread. Yet St. Francis' mother was an excellent Christian, who certainly impressed on her child the greatest devotion to the Holy Father and the Roman Church. Though his father was highly incensed at seeing his son embrace a life of poverty when he had dreamed only of worldly success for him, we have no reason to suspect his perfect submission to the Church. Francis himself was the most devoted child of the Church, which he loved as his mother and respected to the last day of his life. Yet the great remedy offered by St. Francis against the ills of his time, the ideal which he cherished and taught to all, was

[23] *Op. Cit.*, p. 72. Add to this that the Pseudo-Dyonisius, which exercised such an influence on Christion asceticism, largely depended on Plotinus.

[24] Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, "Buddhist Gnosticism, the System of Basilides," 1902, pp. 377-415.

substantially that same poverty which the religious reformers of his time practiced and preached. The heretics of St. Francis' time, like the Manicheans, the Gnostics and Buddhists, taught a doctrine which indeed was not St. Francis', but which brought them to the same conclusions. They resolved the problem of evil by the dual principle of good and evil. The soul came, they said, from the good principle; but matter and everything material, like wealth, temporal possessions, trade and commerce, matrimony, are an evil and must be avoided, for they all come from the evil principle. Many held like Buddha that the soul had been imprisoned in the body to atone for the faults committed during some previous life, and would continue transmigrating from body to body until perfect purity is attained. As a consequence of their doctrines, they practiced great austerities and, above all, poverty. However, as among the Buddhists and later among the Franciscans, so also among the Cathari and the Albigenses there were two classes—the "Perfecti," who avoided as much as could be done in this life contact with matter and renounced property and marriage, and the "Credentes," whose obligations were much lighter and who could own property and live in marriage. Of course, there remains this great difference between Francis and these heretics, that they based their practices on a philosophy in opposition to the doctrines of the Church. Francis had no philosophy; speculation was the very opposite of his simple, concrete understanding of things. He could rather be compared—and has often been compared—to the Waldenses and the various bands of Apostolicals, who simply preached a return to apostolic poverty. Yet the ideal of poverty was in the air among all good-minded Christians, heretics or faithful children of the Church, and there is no doubt that the success of the Cathari and Albigenses largely contributed to disseminate the idea of the "poor life" among the people, particularly the suffering classes, and so far there may have been an indirect influence of Buddhism on the Franciscan movement.

Besides this probable, though indirect influence, there is an element which we must not overlook and which goes further to account for the similarity between these different movements. The same craving of the human heart after unhampered happiness has a tendency to manifest itself in a similar manner, particularly when the circumstances of time, place, conditions, etc., are largely similar. Hence the same disgust which fills every human soul at the inability of earthly joys to satisfy the demand for happiness has led Buddha, the Essenes, the Therapeutae, the heretics of St. Francis' time and St. Francis himself to give up the seeking of happiness in wealth and sensual pleasures and to adopt poverty as the means to a perfect life.

It is the same frame of mind from which arise to-day numerous protests against the conventionalities and enslaving customs of our age and the appeals to the "simple life," to a life more natural, more conducive to health, virtue and happiness.

In Francis, however, this craving for a life of poverty was ennobled by a deep supernatural sense and a most lively spirit of faith. The example of Christ and the Apostles was for him a greater incentive than the desire to free himself from worldly cares. Then Christ Himself, he thought, had revealed to him that he should, and how he should, practice the new life. All he did and said he did and said on the word of Christ. He did not want to hear of the rule of St. Augustine, St. Benedict and others; his rule came directly from Christ. If it had been a human product he could have modified it; but since it came from Christ, he had no right to make the slightest change in it. His brethren would go to Cardinal Ugolino and plead with him that he interfere and "persuade Brother Francis to follow the counsel of wise brethren and to allow himself now and then to be led by them. And they alleged the rule of St. Benedict, St. Augustine, St. Bernard, who taught thus and thus." But even Cardinal Ugolino could not do anything, and Francis would not hear of any other rule than "that which the Lord had shown and given him in His mercy."[25] In fact, his brethren as well as himself could hear the voice of Christ in the air: "Francis, there is nothing in the rule which is thine, but whatever is there is Mine, and I will that the rule be thus observed to the letter, to the letter without gloss, without gloss, without gloss."[26]

III.

If we examine more closely the parallel drawn between Buddha and Francis and their movements, we will soon notice the fact that the similarity is rather external, while there are internal differences, differences in character, spirit, aim, which are essential and point to opposition.

The foundation of Buddha's life and work was the belief in the transmigration of the soul. Brahmanism, of which Buddhism was an offshoot, entertained a very pessimistic view of human existence. Rebirth was at best a punishment for some previous guilt, and life was looked upon as an expiation. Nor did Buddha improve much this gloomy view of life. For him life was not worth living, and the only purpose of man should be to extinguish it, not by suicide, because the consequence would have been a rebirth in a state worse than the former, but by the destruction of all desires, even of all

[25] Spec. Perf. Cap., 68.
[26] Spec. Perf. Cap. I.

conscious actions. Pessimism was the cause of Buddha's change of life. Existence was a burden to him from his very earliest years; nor was there any hope for the future until he had found the secret of annihilation, or rather of an unconscious repose in Nirvana, a state very much akin to annihilation. If all our desires, even the most legitimate and the most generous, are an evil; if our ideal must be a passive indifference to all that exists; if the best that can be hoped for is the destruction—not the satisfaction—of our natural cravings, then indeed life is not worth living. True, there is an element of joy in Buddhism, as said above, but it is nothing else than the doubtful satisfaction of having destroyed all desires.

Very different was the foundation of Francis' reform. There was no pessimism in him; his was from the very beginning a joyous existence. It is true he did not find in the pleasures of the world all the satisfaction that he expected, but it was because there appeared to him something more beautiful, greater, nobler than anything that he had seen before or ever dreamed of. The gaiety of the "corti," the glory of the battlefield were dwindling into insignificance when compared to the vision of Lady Poverty, Francis' bride forever. Life for Francis was well worth living; it was the gift of God and a great gift, given us to be enjoyed, and none enjoyed it more than Francis and his first companions. It was a joy so intense that he could not help congratulating the birds, the lambs, all the animals of creation for having received from God this great blessing.[27].

It is true Francis taught men to control their desires; but it was to harmonize them better. Men had lost sight of the proper order of things; they had forgotten God and thought only on themselves; heaven was obscured by the enjoyment of earth. Francis shows them again the proper hierarchy; earth is God's creature, created for the use of man, but only to help him to reach heaven more securely. Hence Francis and his companions enjoyed earth and its joys; but there was for them a higher and better home, heaven; a nobler object of their love, God. Hence they repressed all low desires of the soul to transfer their energy to the higher desires of all that is God's and heaven's.

Hence the opposite views of Buddha and Francis on marriage and labor. With a perfect logic, Buddha condemned the procreation of life and matrimony. The lay members of his community, who lived

[27] I. Cel., 58, Tract. Mir. 20. A comparison between the Buddhist beatitudes given in the tenth volume of the Sacred Books of the East, II., "Sutta Nipâta," pp. 43-44, and the seventh chapter of the Fioretti on Perfect Joy will prove most interesting to the reader. Both extracts are later writings and not strictly historical, but they introduce us into the spirit of the movements and throw light on the different conceptions of happiness held by Buddha and Francis.

in the married state, could not expect to attain Nirvana, but only to prepare themselves for a rebirth in a somewhat less miserable existence. Labor, which serves only to support life and to satisfy the desires of man, was likewise condemned. It was the teaching of Brahmanism that labor was unworthy of a Brahman. Agriculture, cattle-raising and a few other occupations were merely tolerated in case of necessity. Most trades which we consider as honest, like those of the carpenter, tailor, tanner, physician, were held by Brahmans to be impure. Buddha made no attempt to rehabilitate labor, which could bring no advantage, no improvement. The members of his order should not work, but must live on alms, or, in the words of the Buddist Scriptures, the Bhikkhu "must gain his subsistence by the labor of his feet," that is "beg for his food . . . with the exertion of the muscles of his feet."[28]

Marriage was never condemned by Francis, and the members of the Third Order who lived in the state of marriage could reach heaven as well as the members of the First Order. The latter, however, practiced chastity in order to imitate more closely Our Lord and His Mother, to be better united to God and better able to consecrate their lives to His service and to the salvation of others. What an immense difference between the reformer who censured procreation and the sweet St. Francis, who made a nest for the "chaste" doves "that they might bring forth their little ones and multiply according to the precept of their Creator."[29] Labor was to him a duty for all men. The brethren themselves, who by their profession of dispensing spiritual food to the people seemed exempt from manual labor, were required by their rule to practice a trade or at least some manual occupation, not only as a means of avoiding idleness or out of virtue, but also as a means of supporting themselves. It was only when this means failed that they were allowed to have recourse to the "table of the Lord," that is, to begging. Francis approved not only of agriculture, but of all honest trades. Son of a merchant, he became the apostle of towns which were the headquarters of merchants and artisans.

There was something more in the characters of Buddha and Francis which made them the very antipodes of each other. Buddha had a very indistinct view of the spiritual world, of God, or rather of the gods, for he had no belief in a supreme personal God. Like the Brahmanists of his time, he believed in a multiude of gods, men, animals, continually interchanging conditions. But for him there was no God to love, to serve, to honor. Vagueness and even contradiction affect all his teaching regarding Nirvana and the future

[28] P. Bigandet, "The Life or Legend of Gaudama," II., p. 278; two vols., London, 1880.

[29] Act. B. Franc, Cap. 24.

life. The subsistence of the "ego" in the future state of those who attained the perfection of "Buddhas" should not be affirmed nor denied. It was the absence of desires, fears, joys, pains, in fact, of personal existence itself. Beyond that nothing could be said nor should be said. To over-inquisitive disciples he replied: "Whatsoever has not been revealed by me, let that remain unrevealed; and what has been revealed, let it be revealed."[30]

For Francis, on the contrary, nothing was more real than the spiritual world. There was a constant and immediate intercourse between him and the saints in heaven, between him and God. He lived with them, saw them, spoke with them and loved them with all his heart. For him heaven was a goal to reach, not so much because it was the end of a laborious life as because it was the beginning of a new life, better, happier, in the company of God and of the saints, without any fear of offending Him whom he loved.

These opposite views of the spiritual world are the source of other contrasts between Francis and Buddha. While Buddha gave up all the pleasures of this world and condemned himself to a life of asceticism merely to attain the subduing of his desires and passions, Francis did all for very love of God and of his neighbor. While Buddha aimed only at the extinction of suffering, Francis sought suffering for the glory of God; but for him suffering was a joy and a treasure. We cannot be blind to the disinterestedness of Buddha, who spent a long life in efforts to communicate to others what he thought was the key to the abolition of suffering; nor can we be blind to the admirable principles by which he inculcated in all the love for each other: "By love alone can we conquer wrath. By good alone can we conquer evil. . . . Do to others that which ye would have them do to you. . . . Say no harsh words to your neighbor."[31] Yet we must not lose sight of the ultimate motive—the avoidance of suffering, both in this world and in the next. Francis believed in the reform of the world through love, and the words last quoted from the Buddhist text often, no doubt, passed his lips; but they had a higher and nobler import: "Love one another as God has loved you. . . . Love all God's creatures because God loves them all, etc." Not only was Francis unselfish in his love; he wanted this unselfish love in all men; let them all act for the very love of God, of Christ, of the saints, of all.

A further comparison may be made between the miracles of Francis and those of Buddha. The latter's are childish feats, which

---

[30] Hermann Oldenberg, "Buddha, His Life, His Doctrine, His Order," London, 1882, p. 276.

[31] A. Lillie, "The Influence of Buddhism on Primitive Christianity," London, 1893, pp. 47-48.

raise a smile on the face of the serious; nor have they any character but that of extravagance. The miracles of Francis, on the contrary, are all wonders of charity, grace, simplicity and love.

Hence, in character, spirit and aim Francis is infinitely superior to Buddha. Yet we find ourselves in the face of an apparently strange fact, the same fact to which H. Thode calls our attention: "The achievements of Buddha . . . have exercised an influence on thousands of years," while "the ideals of Francis . . . after a few centuries have been supplanted by other ideals more progressive than his." A movement is to be judged by its success. Now the Franciscan movement, begun in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, lost its first fervor and first efficacy soon after the death of the first generation of Franciscans. Some attempts were made now and then to rouse its torpent power, but it was only for a short time. True, it has not ceased to do good, and to-day the three orders of St. Francis are not only still in existence, but even prosperous. Yet what is the Franciscan movement to-day compared to the Buddhist? The number of Buddhists throughout the world is generally stated to be about four hundred and fifty millions. This may be exaggerated, and some bring it down to as low an estimate as one hundred millions. But even at this low figure, how can Franciscanism compare with Buddhism?

It must be kept in mind that Buddhism, though probably not intended by its founder as a new religion, became such as a matter of fact, while Franciscanism was and remained only a movement within a well organized religion. In other words, Buddha has founded a new religion; Francis has reformed the members of an existing religion. Virtue and love were at a low ebb when Francis appeared; the movement that he inaugurated had no other aim but to bring back the first fervor. Nothing was further from Francis' mind than to create a new philosophy, a new sect; his three orders were to be the instruments of a beneficent action on the Christian Church by inciting all her children to a better and holier life. Indeed, the First Order has had its ups and downs, but it has never ceased to do the good for which Francis had destined it, and the mention of a comparison between these saintly and zealous apostles and the slothful, ignorant and inefficient Buddhist monks of our day sounds like an outrage. What has become of the order of women founded by Buddha almost against his will? The Poor Clares and all the branches of the Second Order of St. Francis have ever prospered since their foundation. The Third Order has done wonders in the political and social as well as in the religious field, and in this respect far surpasses the lay foundation of Buddha. Buddhism has not raised its adepts to a higher level, and its members to-day

can hardly be said to be much superior in civilization to those of Buddha's time, more than twenty-five centuries ago. It is not, however, that we wish to attribute to St. Francis all the glory of our social progress; but he has done his share and has given to the cause of civilization an impetus which still lasts. His work cannot be separated from that of Christianity, and it is as much superior to that of Buddha as Christianity itself is superior to Buddhism.

LEO L. DUBOIS, S. M.

Washington, D. C.

"NEW THEOLOGY," OLD SUPERSTITION AND MODERN SCIENCE.

DR. CRAPSEY startled the world not a little by his recent pronouncements on Christianity and morals. An English divine, Rev. Dr. Campbell, of Cambridge, following his arguments to the *reductio ad absurdum* point, reasoned to his own satisfaction that the sinner, when he sins, is but rendering homage to God in his own way and according to his conceptions of his obligation to God.

Rev. Mr. Campbell is the logical heir-at-law of Rev. Dr. Crapsey. His work on "The New Theology" made its appearance soon after the sentence of expulsion was decreed against that bold but by no means original theorist. Its statements of a revised "Christian doctrine" are now being discussed all over the Protestant world, and Protestants, as a consequence, are asking themselves what the "Reformation" meant and what "Calvinism" meant as a reformation of the "Reformation." The principal articles of the Campbell creed are embodied in these extracts from his book, placed under headings:

GOD—"The mysterious Power which is finding expression in the universe, and which is present in every tiniest atom of the wondrous whole." "Where . . . is the dividing line between our being and God's? There is no dividing line except from our side." "My God is my deeper self and yours, too."

EVIL—Evil "is not a thing in itself, it is only the perceived privation of what you know to be good, and which you know to be good because of the very presence of limitation, hindrance and imperfection."

SIN—"Sin is the opposite of love. . . . Sin is therefore selfishness." "But sin has never injured God except through man. It is the God within who is injured by it rather than the God without."

DIVINITY OF CHRIST—"In Him humanity was divinity; and divinity, humanity." "Any special insight which He possest into the true relations of God and man was due to the moral perfection of His nature, an dnot to His metaphysical status. He was God manifest in the flesh because His life was a consistent expression of divine love, and not otherwise. But He was not God manifest in the flesh in any way which would cut him off from the

rest of human kind." "Jesus was the child of Joseph and Mary, and had an uneventful childhood."

"Humanity was divinity; and divinity, humanity." Could anything be more simple in the way of dialectic statement? One is immediately reminded of the dual character of Wordsworth's literary form, according to Byron—the genius

> Who both by presecept and example shows
> That prose is poetry; and poetry, prose.

A large part of the Protestant world is shocked at the conduct of Dr. Crapsey and the book of Dr. Campbell. The spectator at a bout of target practice might as well be surprised and pained that a cannon ball hits something when its course is run. The shot that was "heard around the world" when Luther fired his mortar is now well nigh spent, and the shell may soon be expected to burst, to the dismay of the cannoneer's friends and followers and the satisfaction of the friends of peace with God.

The "New Theology," or rather its author, disclaims pantheism, no doubt; but the disclaimer is useless. He cannot place limitations on logical inference, no more than he can sweep away limitations and then try to establish others. The doctrine he preaches as to sin and its punishment—so far as he admits that sin is anything substantial—sweeps away the whole Christian system resting on the doctrine of the Atonement. As to the future life he postulates these dogmatic propositions:

"Everlasting punishment is impossible. While sin remains in the universe God is defeated; everlasting punishment involves His everlasting failure. There is no such thing as punishment, no far-off judgment day, no great white throne, and no Judge external to ourselves. The true resurrection is spiritual, not material. Heaven and hell are states of the soul. . . . When a guilty soul awakens to the truth, hell begins. Salvation and atonement are just as operative on the other side of death as on this."

But Dr. Campbell's theories may seem to himself new; in reality, their substance is very, very old. Other theorists have maintained that sin and pain are unreal, on the principle propounded by Berkeley and earlier enunciated by Shakespeare, through the mouth of Lady Macbeth, "The living and the dead are but as pictures." The bold theory of Luther which, recognizing the reality of sin, made its commission something like a virtue, as a debt for which the great Ransom was paid, finds its fitting climax in the new discovery of Cambridge that sin is really a tribute to the God of holiness—not the sort of homage that vice pays to virtue, but the sinner's mode of carrying on the quest for the higher life and ultimate happiness. This view accords pretty closely with that of the great impostor of

Mecca. But belief in the truth of the theory is not altogether confined to Mahometans or unorthodox Church of England preachers. We find a partial adherence to it, every year or every couple of years, embodied in the resolutions of grand juries in this country, Protestants for the most part, on the subject of immorality in cities. These postulate that such vice is "a necessary evil," and advocate for it, on that account, a recognition and a protection by the State and municipal law.

Rénan, who began this work of destroying belief in the Divinity of Christ, was successful with a wide circle mainly because of the fascination of his literary style. Dr. Campbell possesses a like gift, though he is not so profoundly versed in Oriental lore as Rénan was, it is to be presumed. Anglican organs affected to make light of the effect of his book. The *Morning Post,* the organ of the aristocratic element in Church and State, declared that it was "impossible to take the book seriously," and that there was "not enough brain work behind it to make it of the least value to philosophical discussion." This lofty attitude only proves that the steam gauge is out of order, and is therefore an unsafe guide for the man in charge of the generator. In the enormous demand for the book the first effect of its message is best seen. Twenty thousand copies of it were sold in ten days, immediately after it was put on the publishers' counters. Everybody in England is discussing it—railway porters, traveling salesmen—even cattle dealers, most unlikely class of all as polemical debaters. There is nothing more striking in the moral phenomena of our age than the avidity with which the unreasoning world—the man in the street—snatches at novelties in the sphere of religion—and particularly at such new ideas as tend to lessen its obligations as to practical fulfillment and conscientious satisfaction. The argument from conscience once removed, all restraint must be cast to the winds by the many. Fear of future punishment vanishes in the contemplation of a Deity who looks with equal complacency on sin and holiness. Mahomet, Dowie and Mrs. Eddy have demonstrated that the most successful theology is that which teaches that "the easiest way is the best way."

It is curious to observe the make-up of the forces which, starting out from different realms of thought, now work toward a common objective—the citadel of Christianity. Theology, Science and Sociology—all claiming the right to the word "new," in the sense of improved or modern, or what is smartly called "up to date"—form the triple line of attack. The first work to be done before the abattis is reached is the destruction of the *chevaux de frise* of morality. This is still a formidable obstacle, for even though the idea of the supernatural be demolished, there is still the tanglework of conven-

tionality and inveterate custom and tradition to be broken down. Of late the quest for the great panacea, proclaimed by Lessing, and Marx, and Tolstoi, has developed some new and often unpleasant tendencies, especially among members of what we still reverently term the gentler sex. The lines of investigation taken up by many frequently lead into what has been hitherto regarded as forbidden ground, but that fact does not deter the race of the emancipated. Readers of social magazines know that the female mind, when the desire for knowledge, useful or the reverse, is aroused, do not hesitate to enter the temple of Eleusis and penetrate to the places reserved for the initiated. This boldness is not without its effect upon the multitude. What is learned in the class room and discussed at the feminine symposium following is soon reflected in the mirror of fiction. Hence such startling literary excursions as were found in "The Heavenly Twins" and "The History of Sir Richard Calmady."

There are many roads, highways not merely, but byways too, to Eleusis. They do not all bear sign posts, but may look innocent and inviting enough to the unwary or careless traveler. No harm, it may well be thought, can arise from attendance at a ladies' gathering for the purpose of discussing social problems. Such academic things serve to dissipate *ennui* and afford openings for the ambition of the learned among womankind. Let us take a glance at a few of the séances and observe how such an easy-going view fits in with the actual conditions.

Quite recently there was a gathering of ladies here for the consideration of social and ethical problems. One of the papers read produced a mild sensation. It was a strong defense of superstition among remote and semi-civilized peoples. The fair investigator found that such populations are ignorant of religion, and are very rich in superstitions. They have a dread of wrongdoing because of the inevitable consequences that they believe ensue when occult influences are defied. This is the only restraint such peoples possess. Therefore superstition, the fair logician postulated, was a good thing. She may have been striking at people in Wall street or among the American "four hundred," under the designation of uncivilized tribes —for Wall street has its superstitions about lucky and unlucky things no less than the Cimmerian Esquimaux, and the "four hundred" believe as implicitly in the sinisterness of No. 13—even to the White House—as the Calabrian rustic in the evil eye. But the purpose of her argument was to demonstrate the utility of superstitions, and it therefore had the same meaning and intent as the theory of our high-minded moralists, the grand jury men, that what is "necessary" ceases to be evil when it is found to be "necessary"—or at least too deeply rooted in our social system and our fallen nature for suc-

cessful attack. If our implements are too short or too weak for the work of eradication or demolition, the best course is to throw them away and say the task is too great for Hercules. Such is the inference deducible from this sort of reasoning.

Before Calvin condemned his rival, Servetus, to the stake he asked him did he mean to sustain the proposition that the devil was a part of God, as he maintained that the benches on which they sat in the court house were parts of God. "Can you doubt it?" sneered Servetus, by way of affirmative. To maintain that sin is part and parcel of the agencies by means of which the Lord of Holiness works out His mighty will is to maintain that two things mutually destructive can meet and mingle in safety—to maintain that wisdom and madness, love and hatred, purity and lewdness are indistinguishable. And it is precisely this ridiculous sort of proposition which the new school of homiletics has been started to maintain.

What essential difference is there between this view of human existence and the relation of men to the universe, and that of the Epicurean Greeks, which they embodied in the system called Hedonism? Everything that afforded pleasure, no matter whether it agreed with the moral law or not, became with that school an agency of good. The "new theology," as the thing is called in England, is only a Hedonism, nor is this Hedonism by any means new. It is simply old Epicureanism—the same unutterable abomination that made the life and practice of great philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, even Socrates, some say, so gross a contradiction to their moral teachings.

The plea for the preservation of superstition is the same in essence as the plea for the maintenance of the bagnio and the gambling house. Human nature, divested of responsibility before God, irresistibly inclines toward unlawful pleasure and the desire of gain. Gambling, in the new theology—that is, endeavoring to gain the property of some one else by means other than honest labor—is condemned as immoral. But the gratification of sensuality is looked upon as a mere foible. Therefore, as the task of legislating it out of existence is regarded as impracticable, it is separated from the other form of lust and recommended to the tutelage and protection of the law.

The flag of Great Britain to-day flies over the temples of superstition and idolatry in India and protects both. But it will not allow a gambling house openly to carry on its trade under its imperial cognisance. It will not permit a smuggler to cheat the imperial revenue. But it affords full protection to the heathen temple and the indulgence in the orgies of fanatical followers of Siva and Vishnu. The Rev. W. J. Mulcahy, in the *New Ireland Review*, quotes an official

document laid before Parliament by one of the Magistrates in Lower Bengal, Mr. Oakley, on the subject of idolatry in India and its terrible results, thus describing the worship of Kale, one of the most popular of the Hindoo goddesses: "The murderer, the robber and the prostitute all aim to propitiate a being whose worship is obscenity and who delights in the blood of man and beast, and without imploring whose aid no act of wickedness is committed. The worship of Kale must harden the hearts of her followers, and to them scenes of blood and crime must become familiar."

Now, when learned people, even women, come forward to plead for toleration of superstition as a kind of moral restraint, in the absence of any better, are we not entitled to ask, could the abandonment of the superstition which results in such conditions as this English Magistrate describes result in any more hideous form of chaos than what he depicts? Possibly we might be reminded that in Ashanti and along the Zambesi and Congo there is one step lower, when men and women feed on the flesh of fellow-creatures like themselves. The practice, too, is a portion of the religious system which regards the gratification of human passions and instincts as a fitting acknowledgment of man's dependency upon superior powers.

A favorite form of depreciation of the Christian system with non-Catholic writers is to try to trace a genetic connection between the customs of paganism and those of the New Law. It is a very old idea, but the flavor of age does not make it musty, but rather enhances it to the gusto of those who delight in the process of dethroning God and placing Him on a level with the debased creations of man's imagination who were styled deities in the archaic systems. A paper devoted to such an object appeared in the issue of the *American Journal of Sociology* for March, 1906, from the pen of Dr. Elsie Clews Parsons. While its literary treatment is severely scientific, its examples and illustrations are quite Pompeiian in their unabashed exposition of detail. Into these it is not necessary to enter. It is sufficient to say that the process of moral vivisection is fully as cold-blooded as the physical horrors denounced by those who shrink from the enrichment of knowledge at the cost of animal pain. The immediate aspect of old paganism brought under comparative criticism is the "Religious Dedication of Women." Here the investigator starts from a theory that such dedication is an offshoot of the basic idea in the offering of tribute to gods—namely, blood sacrifice. Cannibalism, it is suggested, was also another mode of offering such sacrifice. The suttee, or immolation of widows or favorite concubines to the manes of departed chiefs was not in all cases a propitiatory rite; it was the belief in some countries where the practice obtained—and it obtains in many still, as in Ashanti

and Dahomi—that the gods to whom the victims were offered were human in their passions, and the victims were intended for their gratification.

As the dedication of women in pagan lands, whether to the service of imaginary deities or to deified monarchs like the Incas or the Mikados, demanded the surrender of female honor, it will be at once perceived how nice a sense of delicacy in drawing distinctions or establishing analogies is shown in tracing a genetic connection between the objects of dedication of pagan women and of the Catholic religious orders of women. In Peru there were cloisters for the women devoted to the service of the Sun-god, as well as others devoted to that of the Incas, who were believed to be direct descendants of the Sun and the Moon. The writer's treatment of examples shows that the same inability to differentiate between the spiritual and the carnal distinguishes her ideas as to the fusion of Church and State. For instance, this passage: "It would be interesting to know whether the cloistered women of Peru developed from the home-staying celibates" (of the Incas' time) "as in early Christendom, or *vice versâ*. The severity of the punishment inflicted upon violators of the Sun's women" (strangulation, to wit; while the women were buried alive) "is also suggestive of the early Christian practice."

Mark the foregoing—"the early Christian practice." No authority is cited for this implication of a horrible custom. Only this illustration is adduced: "In 826, for example, Louis le Débonnair decreed that the seduction of a nun was to be punished by the death of both partners in guilt; that the property was to be consecrated to the Church, and that if the Count in whose district the crime occurred neglected its prosecution, he was to be degraded, deprived of his office, undergo public penance and pay his full over-gild to the fisc."

Mr. Henry Lea is the authority quoted for the foregoing, but it will be remarked that he is silent about the burying alive part of the indictment. But the chief point to be noted is that the law was that of the Emperor (Louis was the son of Charlemagne, and was crowned as Emperor by Pope Stephen IV.). It was not the act of the Church. The comparatively recent case of Mr. Rider Haggard and his story of a walled-up nun seems to have been quite lost on such learned writers as this scientist.

The want of perception of the spirit of Christianity is painfully apparent in this remarkable dissertation, as the writer went on to develop the argument: "The Christian nun may well be thought of as the descendant of the African wife-priestess and the Peruvian Sun-wife. In Christianity sacrifice passed over from the gift stage

to the self-abnegation stage. And this change in the general conception of sacrifice involved a change in the ideas of the meaning of religious female celibacy. In Christianity, too, the exclusive character of divine proprietorship was thought of rather as precluding sexual intercourse with men than as leading to it with deity. Besides, the idea of a mystical union with deity took the place of ideas of sexual union with deity."

This woful attempt to appreciate and explain the idea of Christian female celibacy is saddening enough, as an evidence of the failure of "science" to grasp the meaning or the spirit of the Catholic religion. But a foot-note to the passage quoted still further emphasizes the inability of the ordinary scientific mind to differentiate between a symbol and a creation of the mind. It runs thus: "Mariology, the widespread medieval beliefs in the existence of *incubi* and *succubi*, the endless instances of sexual pathology in the lives of the saints, and the consecration of the nun with its simulated marriage rite of 'taking the veil' as the 'bride of Christ' show that the primitive attitude of mind was still held by many."

The mystical sense in which imagery is employed both in the Old Testament and the New ought to be sufficiently well understood by people of education. Here we find that, great as the power of language is, it yet falls short of the task demanded of it in the illumination of some special orders of minds. The X-ray is needed here; the ordinary electric light is insufficient.

In more than one passage the writer now under consideration declares than an exhaustive study of the subject of celibacy, masculine as well as feminine, would be necessary in order to have a satisfactory analysis. The question naturally arises, Are the conditions for a satisfactory analysis possible to such minds? Is the conception of the perfect holiness of the Triune God likely to be attained by intellects steeped for years in the corroding solution of materialistic acids? If the due conception of God's awful sanctity could be formed, then might it be not difficult to understand that His all-conquering grace might subdue the imperfect in the human heart and elevate the human soul, by anticipation, to that high plane of sanctification which must be reached by all who desire in spirit and in truth to consecrate their earthly life and all its possibilities of spiritual achievement to His service. But we are dealing here with the mental measurements of Spencer and Darwin: "At present we need only note that religious male chastity may also develop from religious female chastity by the process of false analogy, which plays such an important part in many other social phenomena. When the origin of religious female chastity in divine proprietorship is lost sight of, and the state is also considered one of self-sacrificing

worship, it is naturally thought of as fit for male worshipers as well."

Of course the authority of the Saviour of mankind is of no account in the determination of this delicate question by female logicians—or one that ought to be treated as delicate but is not, but handled entirely "without gloves," to use a graphic popular aphorism. The men whom He selected for His service were bidden to leave father and mother and wife and home, and devote all their hours and all their capabilities of every kind, mind and body, heart and soul, to the sublime task to which He assigned them.

Still there is a minor-key morality—the utilitarian—recognized by such thinkers, as we find in such verdicts as this: "Manu and St. Paul are certainly responsible for untold human misery" (because they preached that continence is a virtue), "but they may also be credited with helping to give a religious sanction to social control of sexuality."

Human happiness, conversely, according to sociological ideals, consists in the gratification of our lower nature. This is not the Christian standard of happiness. The conquest of the baser part of humanity is the triumph of the Christian system. The pure in heart and deed enjoy a beatitude of spirit which can never be estimated by the materialist. To minds steeped in the disgusting lore of the hideous deities of the old Greek mythology and their awful saturnalia, it can hardly be vouchsafed to rise to the conception of the chaste Christian ideal. Can such tell of the horrors of Priapus worship in minute detail, and of the various forms of human degradation which the Hindu system entailed, and pronounce, in the same breath as between the Christian ideal of sanctity and the pagan one?

If the inquiry into "sociology" involve such topics, it may reasonably be asked where the line of decency is to be drawn. The young ladies who are instructed by professors of this kind are not of the age that brings the stoic spirit, and if they prove impervious to the impressions inevitably left upon their minds by the study of humanity in its lowest condition, they must be marvels of invulnerability. Let us see do they prove so. We are enabled to form a judgment on the question by means of an inquiry recently held, and the results of which have been published in the *International Journal of Ethics*. Seventy girls of Wilson College were asked by Miss Amy E. Tanner to put in writing their ideals and views upon some of the most important issues in feminine life. The questions were arranged and formulated thus:

Who is nearest to your ideal person?
What occupation do you wish to follow upon leaving college?
What position of honor would you most like to hold?
Would you rather be the best loved person or the best?

Which do you consider of the most importance, honesty, love of humanity, self-control, chastity or justice?
What do you consider the greatest vice?

It will be noted that the interrogator placed questions of a material or selfish character above those relating to the spiritual and ethical side of human nature. In this fact, which may have been unintentional or accidental, there is an indication of the spirit and tendency of the principle which obtains in secular collegiate life. The institution in question may fairly be taken as typical of the average secular college, and the seventy young ladies questioned all belonged to the upper classes. The replies elicited may also be fairly accepted as the legitimate fruit of the system which makes the study of such subjects as ladies like Mrs. Elsie Clews Parsons make part of their regular classwork, whether the students are destined for the medical profession or not, as we may perhaps not unreasonably assume. The young ladies answered the different queries in the following proportions, as to choice of occupation: "Thirty-five per cent. of them would like to be teachers, ten and a half per cent. doctors, nurses and concert singers, nine per cent. instructors in music, three per cent. mothers, and 'small numbers' kindergartners, librarians, settlement workers and authors."

This is interesting enough as evidence of the level of ideals prevalent in such colleges. Disappointment may be felt over it, yet there is nothing to startle the feelings, as there must be most certainly in the revelations relating to the ideals on the respective moral virtues. The "ideal person" was in nearly every case chosen from other girls in the college; only one-fourth chose an historical character for emulation; and Miss Tanner does not say whether she was Joan of Arc or Elizabeth of England. The order of virtues in the college girls' mind, as Miss Tanner found it, stands thus: "A little more than one-third take honesty; one-fourth, love of humanity; *one-sixth, chastity,* and one-fifth, self-control. One-sixth consider dishonesty the greatest vice; one-third, drunkenness; *one-fifth, impurity of life or unchastity,* and one-fifth, murder."

A truly remarkable showing. Men regard chastity as the jewel of womanhood, without which all other virtues are merely negative. But to find that only a dozen out of seventy women, picked from the best class and the flower of young maidenhood, regard it as of the highest importance, is, as Paul Kruger said, something to stagger humanity. To shock, indeed, as well as to stagger. We could wish that the *Sun,* which commented in a tone of surprise on the revelation, had emphasized its meaning and drawn attention to the fact more strongly, since that celebrated journal reaches a very large Catholic auditory, and a good many foolish Catholic parents prefer one of these secular colleges for the education of their sons or

daughters to a Catholic one, merely because of some vain idea that a better system prevails in the teaching and a certain social superiority is to be gained by secular college life. Can any better service be rendered than that of attracting widespread attention to the low moral tone which forms an accompaniment to this supposititious social superiority? It is now seen that it is at the cost of risk to the noblest possession of womanhood, purity of thought, that such social "betterment," if any, is achieved. Let the foolish Catholic ponder on this startling fact and recall the warning of the Lord of all purity to those who expose the young to scandal. The levity with which the matter was treated by the *Sun* may be due more to an inveterate habit of thought than to a want of discernment as to the relation of the several feminine virtues, but it is, all the same, a matter to be deplored in so influential a mouthpiece of contemporary ethics. "It was a delightful and informing symposium," remarked the *Sun*, "and yet not so informing, for we take it that the girl undergraduates are pretty much the same in their sentiments and yearnings at all the seats of learning. Unspoiled by the higher education, they are not translated to a seventh heaven of perfection to which man could never attain, but they remain on the earth with him, to comfort, delight, improve and sustain and share his futile strivings after the ideal." Wilson College, then, may be regarded as a sample. Much the same may be found in Vassar, Bernard, or any of the other secular colleges for women. Such is the rational inference.

Now, apart from the question of the utility or desirability of forcing on women the study of such subjects as Mrs. Parsons treats in the sociological magazines, the public has a right to ask why she has chosen to introduce the *odium theologicum* into the subject. It is a far-fetched idea and utterly uncalled for. If the law of separation between Church and State be recognized as operative in State-supported schools and private "non-sectarian" foundations, why should insidious attacks upon the holiest ideals in Christianity be suffered to take place under the guise of instruction in physiology, sociology or any other form of pedagogic science? The great object of education is to elevate while informing. We see plainly, from the facts set forth by Miss Tanner, that that object is largely frustrated as far as girls' colleges are concerned, and we would be fairly justified in assuming that the line of studies chosen by ladies who do not shrink from proposing that "trial marriage" shall replace the present order in matrimony, is not free from responsibility as to the failure.

When the lowering of feminine standards is not a deterrent from the pursuit of scientific, or pseudo-scientific, lines of investigation,

it is not to be wondered at if a connection is again sought to be traced between the sublime ideals of the Christian system and the gross sensualism of the sad and tragic pagan era. The real reason for wonder is the indifference of all such discoverers to the charge of plagiarism. All those threads of connection were traced long ago by forgotten fingers. In an old work called "The Veil of Isis" all the points of resemblance indicated by Henry Lea and Mrs. Elsie Clews Parsons were gone over with great zeal and avidity, but it must be owned that the early discoverers and commentators had the decency to refrain from putting into print the details of that debasement that often makes a man of the present day blush to remember that his descent is not from the unreasoning brute rather than the reasoning prototype of himself. Superstition, even of the darkest and most hideous kind, is regarded as a form of seeking after God, and therefore to be tolerated, if not fostered and honored. We have more than once heard the sigh of regret for the extinction of Aztec "civilization" and its supersession by the "idolatry and superstition" of the Catholic system, while not a spasm of horror or a groan of anguish was discernible over the awful hecatombs of slaughtered human beings cut to pieces on the colossal sacrificial stone before the sanguinary deity of the Aztec worship. We see rather a disposition to connect Christianity with such horrible butchery and debauchery by a sort of infernal "apostolic succession," and make the cause of the slaveholder and the slave liberator one and the same.

These woful aberrations of the modern mind are traceable, for the most part, to the new spirit of scientific inquiry. This spirit often proceeds on a false assumption. It looks upon religion much as a cat does upon a dog, as its natural enemy. In discussing the place of science in modern civilization, Professor Thorstein Veblen, writing in the same *Journal of Sociology* from which we have been quoting, admits the false pretensions on which the sort of science that seeks to substitute itself for religion in the philosophy of life and morals rests. "On any large question which is to be disposed of for good and all, the final appeal is by common consent taken to the scientist." So much for the statement of procedure, but what of the efficacy of the process for the vindication of the truth? "The solution offered in the name of science is decisive, *so long as it is not set aside by a still more searching scientific inquiry.*" In the proviso we have italicized lies the refutation of the bold claim that science is to be looked to as the provider of the ultimate truth. When its gnomon is shifting unceasingly, where is the ultimate truth to be looked for? To put the idea in a homely way, it is a case of "Live, horse! and you'll get grass."

The human soul is not interested in science; it is the human thirst for material knowledge that leads the human mind on and on from one *point d'appui* to the next. Science cannot bring balm to the penitent sinner, nor bid the tear of the mourner cease to flow. This is the office of Christ the Consoler, who taught the world the distinction between God and Cæsar. Science now occupies the place of Cæsar in the new *crux* which the children of Belial offer for the Christian's solution. Its exponents refer to the defenders of Christianity as "the enemy." The discovery is theirs. Christianity is not an enemy to true science; nor can it be true science which proclaims enmity between the two. Were Cæsar identified with God in his laws and rule, Christ would not have raised a barrier of demarcation. Still the probability that the guide which present-day materialism looks to may be, after all, rather a Will-o'-the-Wisp, a mere lambent marsh exhalation, seems to weigh with the advocates of science not very lightly. As Professor Veblen says: "It has come about that men assign it this high place, perhaps idolatrously, perhaps to the detriment of the best and most intimate interests of the race. There is room for much more than a vague doubt that this cult of science is not altogether a wholesome growth"—that it makes for race deterioration, he believes, no doubt, because of the lowering of human ideals. And in very truth, the close following of the technological arguments in which these nebulous ideas of "science"—such as Professor Loeb's—are sought to be defined can hardly fail to lead to deterioration, since each successive step seems to contradict the preceding one's lessons, and the intellectual process becomes at length very much akin to that of Sisyphus in the fable.

If we may admit the pleas of some schools of "science" for an unlimited process of repetition in all nature in the forgotten past as well as in the prospective future, there were "scientists" in the twilight ages of the world no less daring than those who now seek to dethrone God and put Science in His place. There was Prometheus, for instance. The fable of his daring seems to have been left the world only as a stimulative, while the story of his failure and his punishment has lost its moral.

Pleas for the maintenance of ancient superstitions, as moral agencies in their own way, are nothing different in their essence from pleas for the acceptance of the New Theology in its major premiss. God being the author of all things, both good and evil, if these superstitions operate for good, they serve as useful a purpose in the scheme of creation as the things of light. This is really the gist of the argument, no matter what the verbiage which embellishes it. If the theory of divine immanence which it preaches be a true one, Servetus should never have been sent to the stake. The stake and

fagots which burnt him were portion of God, the bench from which Calvin's decree was pronounced was portion of God; nay, the very Devil himself, whom he was supposed to have renounced in baptism, was of God's personality, which pervades all things ever made or ever to be made.

Old superstition, it must be owned, was innocent, childlike belief, in its logical deductions, as compared with the reasoning of the New Theology and some tenets of the new science. The curious feature in the theory of the first-named is the inability to perceive its self-destructive character on the part of those who propound it. If the word God mean "good"—as most philologists maintain—byderivation, then such a thing or quality as good there must be; and if all things be the quality known as good, then there hardly be any need of classification into good and evil. All creation is a vast monosyllable. Virtue and vice are identical; sin disappears; sense is the same as nonsense; the millennium of fools has arrived.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia, Pa.

SOME CRITICISMS ON "SUPERNATURAL RELIGION."[1]

THE authenticity of the New Testament, and especially of the Gospels, is a question which during the last century has very much exercised the minds of critics and has been discussed with the most intense eagerness. The controversy began in the latter part of the eighteenth century, and it was brought to a crisis which aroused the gravest anxiety throughout Europe by the publication of Strauss' life of Jesus in 1835. His destructive criticism was succeeded by that of Baur and the Tubingen school and subsequently by Renan.

Numerous writers of great critical acumen rallied from all creeds to champion the divinity of the Christian religion thus imperiled, and our adversaries have been beaten back from point to point, till such critics as Renan and Baur have to take refuge in the impossibility of the Supernatural. That this citadel is far from impregnable it will be my endeavor to show in the first part of this paper.

The prolonged and vehement character of the contest about the Gospels is certainly not disproportioned to its importance; for nothing can be of more consequence to Christians than to know whether they are merely a pôt-pourri of more or less edifying and interesting

[1] Rationalist Press Association, London.

but fictitious reading, or whether, on the contrary, we have in them four faithful records of the life, the teaching, the death and the resurrection of Our Lord and God.

The work entitled "Supernatural Religion" has been published anonymously and has enjoyed a very wide popularity. It has passed through several editions and has evoked replies from some of the most eminent scholars in England.[2] It has recently been issued at a popular price by the Rationalist Press Association. The first part of the work is an elaborate attack on the credibility of Revealed Religion in general, and in the second part it is sought to undermine in detail the authority of the Gospels and of the Acts of the Apostles. The author is not a great critic like Strauss or Renan, but he canvasses with great industry and discrimination the views of others, so it may be taken for granted that his book contains the last word that unbelief has to say against the Christian postion. This fact, as well as the device of anonymity, no doubt accounts for the great popularity of the work.

I.

In the beginning of the book the author essays to show that on Christian principles we can never know whether a supposed miracle (and consequently the revelation which it guarantees) is from God or the devil, especially as it is only from revelation itself that we can know the existence of God, and hence that we are completely in the dark as to the evidential value of any particular miracle. This contention is quite innocuous as far as Catholics are concerned, who can prove from reason the existence of a just and holy God, who has a loving care for His creatures, but it completely demolishes the traditionalist position which many Anglican divines such as Mansel and Wescott seem to have taken up. In his efforts to prove from Scripture that the devil can effectually mask his deformity and pose as an angel of light to our undoing, the author considerately ignores the fact that we are told that in the case of antichrist the just will not be led away, and in the case of the sorcerers before Pharaoh that their connection with the father of lies was evidently proved by the superior miracles of Moses.

He next devotes several chapters in proving to his own satisfaction from Milman, Newman and others that when the miracles of the New Testament are supposed to have been performed, reputed miracles were the order of the day; all nations had them in abundance and expected them of every new religion. "The Jews," he says, "and their heathen neighbors were too accustomed to supposed

[2] Lightfoot and Sanday and Wescott.

preternatural occurrences to feel much surprised at the account of the Christian miracles," and again: "No attempt is made to deny the fact that miracles are common to all times and to all religious creeds."[3] The inference being, of course, that it was easy for the Apostles, having imagined the miracles of Christ, to foist them on the belief of an uncritical age. But surely Christ knew the signs of the time in which He lived, and it would be fatuous for Him to appeal, as He did, to miracles as a definite proof that His doctrines and those of His Apostles were from above if miracles were a matter of course in His day. In this connection our author never mentions Gibbon, so he probably never read his history or heard of his famous third cause; and Gibbon is an honorable man, whose knowledge of those early times is unrivaled and whose bias in favor of Christianity is not sufficient to warp his judgment as to the cogency of miraculous or professedly miraculous evidence in the early days of our faith.

The author next comes to Hume's famous argument against the possibility of miracles, which he religiously accepts, indeed, defends with the misdirected zeal that he considers the peculiar characteristic of religious apologetes. This argument colors his views throughout the entire book as to the sufficiency of evidence; in fact, in one place he almost says that he would accept the resurrection on St. Paul's testimony if it were not a priori incredible. To the same intent Baur has said: "The capital argument for the later origin of our Gospels remains always this, that they represent so much in the life of Christ in a manner in which in reality it never could have happened," and Renan says much the same. More recently M. Loisy assigns to the Gospels Matthew and Luke a date subsequent to 70 A. D., and for one reason because the historian, as such, cannot admit the existence of a prophecy such, for instance, as that of the destruction of Jerusalem. It is of the greatest importance, then, to examine closely Hume's argument—the stock-in-trade of all who deny the credibility or possibility of the miraculous or supernatural. Our author, too, invites special attention to it and twits apologists with having seldom ventured an attack on such a stronghold of unbelief. Here is the argument as it is set forth in extenso in "Supernatural Religion" in Hume's own words:

II.

"A wise man proportions his belief to the evidence. In such conclusions as are founded on an infallible experience, he expects the event with the last degree of assurance and regards his past experience as a full proof of the future existence of that event."

Having developed this point, he goes on: "A miracle is a viola-

[3] Loisy, "Auteur d'un Petit Livre," 32, insinuates the same.

tion of the laws of nature, and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle from the very nature of the fact is as entire as any argument from experience that can possibly be imagined. Why is it more probable that all men must die; that lead cannot of itself remain suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood and is extinguished by water, unless it be that these events are found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these laws, or in other words a miracle to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle if it once happened in the common course of nature. It is no miracle that a man seemingly in good health should die on a sudden, because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle that a dead man should come to life, because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must, therefore, be a uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And as a uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full proof from the nature of the fact against the existence of any miracle; nor can such a proof be destroyed or the miracle rendered incredible but by an opposite proof which is superior. Hence," he concludes, "when any one tells me that he saw a dead man raised to life, I immediately consider with myself whether it is more probable that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact which he relates should really have happened. I weigh the one miracle against the other, and if the falsehood of his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates, then, and not till then, can he pretend to command my belief." So far the argument. Now what is to be said in answer to it?

The first remark that suggests itself is that Hume's objection is completely irrelevant. It does not touch miracle at all according to the Catholic or Christian idea. For, according to Hume, the essence of a miracle consists in the fact that it is opposed to the uniform and unalterable experience of mankind. "It is a miracle," he says, "that a dead man should come to life, because that has never been observed in any age or country." With us, on the contrary, it would be a true miracle, though people in every age and country were raised to life again as fast as they died. In our view a miracle is essentially the violation of a certain objective order that is entirely independent of our experience. Nor is this an accidental misapprehension of the Christian position by Hume, for being a Sensist and denying all causality, and even the existence of the material world other than as a cluster of transitory impressions on our minds, his only concept of a law of nature could be as something within us, the

product of experience; and hence his only idea of miracle something that ran counter to experience. If Hume had lived when the planet Neptune was discovered or radium, he should either revise his concept of the laws of nature and of the objective value of our ideas, or else admit the hated existence of a miracle. But to carry the war into the enemy's country, I would remark in the next place that it is but beating the air on Hume's part to take such elaborate trouble to negative the possibility of a miracle, or, which is the same thing, to establish the inviolability of the laws of nature, when he makes such laws beforehand the products of an experience that is firm, infallible and mark the word unalterable. Query: How does Hume bring infallibility and inalterability into his theology, when he and the other Sensists contemptuously reject any such mystical tie as causality, which an ordinary man would think alone competent to account for these high attributes? It will be observed, of course, that Hume's statement about a dead man having never come to life is an impudent petitio principii. Another very important point: Hume says if any one ask me to believe that a man was raised from the dead, I have urging me to believe the miracle the testimony of this individual, and urging me to disbelieve I have the universal experience of mankind. But even granting that a man never was raised from the dead, have I—the individual—the universal experience of mankind testifying that? I—the individual—have nothing of the kind, for I must rely on the word of individuals as to what was or was not the experience of all. I cannot get at the experience of the race but through the testimony of individual members. In the particular case in question I have only the testimony of one or more who heard it from one or more others, and so on back, that a dead man never came to life.

As a consequence, when I as a prudent man want to make up my mind as to the reality or the reverse of a supposed miracle, I have to contrast the trustworthiness of the person telling me the story, not at all with the trustworthiness or experience of all men, as Hume supposes, but with the trustworthiness of the one or more individuals that told me on the authority of one or more others that the story in question is opposed to the universal experience. Lastly, if the belief of men is able to generate a law of nature, as Hume seems to suppose, then the existence of miracles is such a law, for all men, practically speaking, believed in them up to very recent times. You will the better realize how little there is against the possibility of miracles when you see Huxley—certainly no partisan of the Christian cause—expressing in the nineteenth century (August, 1886) his preparedness to examine with an open mind the testimony in favor of any particular miracle.

In concluding the remarks on the first part of "Supernatural Religion," I have only to say that our author would have inspired more respect for his sincerity if, instead of endeavoring to eliminate the supernatural from the times of Augustine and Tertullian, he had boldly tackled some of the miracles reported every other day from Lourdes, and many of which hard-headed men of science are compelled to give up as susceptible of no natural explanation.

III.

The second and most important part of "Supernatural Religion" is occupied entirely in endeavoring to depreciate the external testimony usually brought forward from the first and second centuries in proof of the authenticity of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

It would be out of the question, of course, for me to discuss in detail the arguments from the writers of that era. Nor is this very necessary, for the fact whether many of those early writers, who all, as we contend, recognized our Gospels and quoted from them without, however, mentioning their authors' names expressly—whether these writers, I say, bear testimony to the authenticity of our Gospels or not depends on the validity of a certain canon of criticism which the author lays down at the beginning of his remarks and applies consistently all through. So if this canon breaks down on analysis, we have, as our author himself confesses, these writers on our side, at least as far as the Synoptic Gospels go, and in this paper we shall concern ourselves only with them. Having examined this canon, we shall consider at some length his treatment of the evidence of Papias, which is very important both by reason of its definiteness and antiquity.[4]

The writers whose testimony the canon in question is intended to elucidate are principally Basilides, a heretic who flourished about 125 A. D.; Valentinus, another heretic who lived about 140; Clement of Rome in his first epistle to the Corinthians, written not later than 70 probably; Polycarp, who wrote about 120, and in particular Justin Martyr, who died 164.[5] We shall pay special attention to Justin, both on account of his numerous quotations from the Gospels and the semi-official character of his apologies.

This canon may be conveniently put in the form of a syllogism, thus: The quotation of certain parts of our Gospels by these early writers, who do not state where they quote from, does not prove that these writers used our Gospels, if they had other sources at hand

[4] St. Irenæus tells us he was a disciple of St. John and familiaris Polycarpi.

[5] The author gives these dates as approximately correct.

whence to get these quotations. And such was the fact, for there were many Gospels which would now be called apocryphal contemporaneous with these early writers—Ergo. Our author thus illustrates this canon: "Let us suppose for a moment," he says, "the Gospel according to Luke to have been lost, like the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of Peter and so many others. In the works of one of the fathers we discover the following quotation from an unnamed evangelical source: 'And he said unto them, the harvest truly is great, but the laborers few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth laborers into His harvest. Go your ways; behold I send you forth as lambs in the midst of wolves.' Apologetic critics," he goes on to say, "would probably maintain that this was a compilation from memory of passages quoted freely from the First Gospel, but as a fact it is a literal quotation from Luke, which, as we have assumed, has been lost."

But even though we acknowledge the existence at a very early date of all those apocryphal Gospels, if we have any regard for a cumulus of probabilities, if we do not reject moral certainty, if we do not consider it incumbent on us to eliminate every element of doubt, however ill-founded, before we accept any proposition, we must hold in consistency that these quotations are taken from our Gospels and from them alone. For they are so numerous, especially in the Clementine epistle and the two apologies of St. Justin; there are so many indescribable and unpremeditated correspondences between them, the turns of expression and sequence of ideas and the contexts in which they occur so coincide, that any reasonable man must be convinced that they are from our Synoptic Gospels rather than from any others, unless, indeed, those others were exact replicas of the canonical ones, and this supposition, of course, would not suit the Rationalist book. Many examples of these quotations can be seen in any introduction to Scripture. As we might expect, our author endeavors to minimize the points of agreement and to exaggerate the divergencies between the sayings and incidents as given in these early writers and in our Gospels; but in his own despite he has to admit the absolute identity of many passages, and as for the others, he grudgingly concedes that statements from the Old Testament are quoted just as loosely. In fact, in many of the quotations the difference between the words of the writers and the words in the Gospels do not differ as much as many of the quotations in the New Testament from the Old differ from the original. To show how hard set our author is to find striking discrepancies, on one occasion he shows up as something that settles the question the difference between a statement of Christ in Oratio recta and the

same statement put in Oratio obliqua by Justin Martyr. And on another occasion, to explain what he calls a misquotation from the Old Testament which Justin says he found in the "Memoirs" and which occurs in our First Gospel, he has the effrontery to remark that Justin did not find this quotation in the "Memoirs" at all, but merely imagined that he did.

But what is the evidence for the existence in the first and second centuries of the Apocryphal Gospels which St. Justin is supposed to call the Memoirs and which he says very suggestively were composed by Apostles and their disciples? The evidence is so slender that it would satisfy no one but the apostles of pure reason where they have a point to make against the Church of God. The first argument is from the preface to St. Luke's Gospel, where he says that "many have taken in hand to set forth in order a narration of the things that have been accomplished among us; according as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word: It seemed good to me also to write to thee in order."[6] The Vulgate equivalent here for "taken in hand" is "conati sunt." The Latin would rather favor the view that the projected narration was not brought to a successful issue by St. Luke's predecessors, but I am bound to confess that the same shade of meaning is not conveyed by the Greek, and besides it is very improbable that no one out of the many succeeded, well equipped as they were for the work according to St. Luke. Having granted this much, I submit that it has to be proved that St. Luke refers to written sources of information at all. And remember that our author does not allege that Justin Martyr and the others may have got their information from oral sources, for very often at any rate they are clearly quoting from some written record. I think, though I have no authority for saying so, that the presumption is that St. Luke refers to oral tradition because when he mentions what the others did he uses the phrase "to set forth in order," and apparently contrasts with that "his own writing in order." Besides, if the accounts he refers to as given by those who were ministers and eye-witnesses of the word from the beginning were actually written, there would be no point in his own writing, and his explanation of how he came to write would be ludicrous, for surely it would be easier and more satisfactory to send on one of these many written and authentic documents to Theophilus than to write a new one himself with knowledge got, as he confesses, at second hand. Such an attempt, apart from inspiration, to supersede the narration of the personal followers of Christ would be an outrage on modesty and good sense, with which we

[6] St. Luke i., 1, 2, 3.

have no right to charge St. Luke. But you will object at once and say that this argument proves that our St. Matthew and St. Mark were not in existence when St. Luke wrote. It does not; it simply proves that he was not aware of their existence, which might very easily happen, especially seeing that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew. But even if we admit that these accounts mentioned by St. Luke were written ones, our author makes no attempt to show that St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Paul are not referred to, who all, on our author's own showing, wrote before St. Luke.

The next proof, which indeed can be called a proof only by courtesy, for the early existence of these pseudo-gospels is that in the third and fourth century we find several apocryphal Gospels mentioned as written by the Apostles—St. James, St. Peter, St. Simon, and so on. Our author does not pretend that these were in the possession of St. Justin and the others, but he asserts—the more vehemently as he does not advance any proof—that their prototypes were. Now, bear in mind that at the end of the second century and beginning of the third our Gospels, and those only (if we except the Gospel according to the Hebrews, of which I shall speak in a moment), are mentioned or at all events recognized as of authority.

They alone were recognized by Irenæus—a disciple of Justin and of Polycarp, who wrote between 180 and 190. He was a native of Asia Minor and a Bishop in Gaul, and thus united in himself the traditions of East and West. Our Gospels only are mentioned by the author of the Muratorian fragment, who wrote a few years earlier still, probably in Rome; by Tertullian, who died 207; by Origen, Clement of Alexandria and Tatian, another disciple of St. Justin. Now if Justin, writing about 150, had these Gospels before him and treated them as canonical Scripture (for the Memoirs were read, he says, in the churches equally with the Old Testament), where did they go to? How did they fall into such utter oblivion that none of these later fathers knew anything of them? How is it that Tatian and Irenæus, both disciples of Justin, utterly ignored them, though put by their master on an equality with the Old Testament? You remember Irenæus' fanciful explanation of why there should be four Gospels and only four. Was it that Irenæus despised the authors of these Gospels—St. Peter, for instance? No. You know his statement about the Roman Church's authority as being the seat of SS. Peter and Paul. Was it perhaps that he discovered that these Gospels, admitted as of the highest authority by his master, were spurious? No; for according to our author he was the most ignorant and uncritical of men, and besides he would have mentioned the discovery; nor would he be so confident in using

his far-fetched analogies that there were four Gospels and only four. But not to labor the point further, if it were proved that the Apostolic F. F. were acquainted with a Gospel, say by St. Peter (and this one and that according to the Hebrews are supposed to be the only ones Justin used), it would be much more resasonable to hold that it was identical with our St. Mark[7] than that every one at the end of the second century and since forgot or ignored its existence.

Whether or not these arguments avail to show that no Gospels distinct from ours existed in the early Church, I contend that they are at least conclusive evidence of the fact that the Apostolic F. F. did not acknowledge their authority, and so that they are not the works these writers quote from as of the highest authority and equiparate in every way with the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Coming now to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it is in quite a different category from the other apocryphal Gospels, for Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Origen speak of it with respect and veneration, and we find frequent and honorable mention of it in the works of other early fathers as well. It was written in Hebrew, and it is evident that the title it now bears cannot have been its actual superscription, but is merely a name descriptive of the readers for whom it was prepared or amongst whom it chiefly circulated. Corrupt copies of it under different names were in circulation among the Ebionites, the Nazarites and other heteredox communities. As far as I can make out, this Gospel is almost certainly the original of our St. Matthew.[8] Our author acknowledges that this was the general opinion of the early Church, and he believes the same himself, but, of course, he is committed to the view that it was hopelessly different from our First Gospel. But let us consider the probability of this last subterfuge of his, and the question arises at once if our Gospel is not a faithful translation of this work, how was the original lost sight of? How was this true work of St. Matthew confessedly extant in the time of Justin and used extensively by him—how was this work, I ask, unknown to his disciples, Irenæus and Tatian, and a false work, utterly different, palmed off on them as the genuine Gospel of the Apostle? How was it overlooked by the author of the Muratorian fragment, who wrote in Rome probably within twenty years after Justin? Again, how is it that Irenæus knows nothing of this Gospel, and his contemporaries, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, quote it as an authority and with the same respect as the other Gospels? These facts can only be explained on the supposition that the Gospel according to the

[7] For all admit that St. Mark's Gospel simply reflects the teaching of St. Peter.

[8] What countenance Papias lends to this view we shall see in the sequel.

Hebrews, substantially at least, agreed with our St. Matthew. The great difficulty of our author to this view is that St. Jerome translated it into Greek, and he goes on to say that if the Greek Gospel had been an accurate translation, of course there could have been no inducement to make another. He forgets, apparently, that St. Jerome corrected the Latin version of the Old Testament and then made a new Latin version of his own.

Finally, it is not without significance, I think, that our author in another place says that this Hebrew Gospel bore the same relation to our St. Matthew that the Gospel Marcion mutilated bore to our St. Luke, and in his last edition he is forced to confess that this Gospel of Marcion was our identical Third Gospel. Now, I contend that the canon on which our author rested his case has been spiked, the bogey of the apocryphal Gospels has been laid and the Apostolic F. F., and particularly St. Justin, bear luminous witness to the existence and authority of our three first Gospels.

IV.

Let us now consider briefly the evidence of Papias, disciple of St. John and Bishop of Hierapolis, who wrote about 140 A. D. in favor of our Synoptic Gospels. He wrote a work in five books entitled "Logion Kyriaka." Only such fragments of this work have come down to us as were preserved by Irenæus and Eusebius.[9]

The meaning of the first word of the title brings us in medias res at once. And the question is, does this word suggest, as our author contends, that Papias meditated a compilation on his own account of the oracles of the Lord, or rather an interpretation—an explanation—of these oracles as already contained in some existing record? Though sometimes used in the first sense, it is generally employed in the second, and in that sense only it is used by Irenæus and Eusebius.[10] That it is used in the same sense here is proved from the following words in the preface, preserved for us by Eusebius: "But I will not scruple also to give a place along with my interpretations to all that I learned carefully in times past from the elders—Peter, James, Simon, etc." Here the sense of exegesis in the title is determined by the unambiguous word "interpretations." Of what, then, was the work an interpretation? Certainly not of the oral traditions, for the interpretations are presupposed and the oral traditions are mentioned subsequently, being introduced to illustrate the interpretations, as is obvious from the words, "I will not scruple *also* (kai) to give a place along with my interpretations to all that I learned carefully in the past from the elders."

[9] Euseb. H. E., III., 39.

[10] Lightfoot.

The "also," which, by the way, our author omits, and the entire structure of the sentence make it evident that his own view and that of the elders were co-relative and did not hold the place respectively of comment and work commented on. Hence it is only reasonable to infer that Papias had before his mind (1) a written text which he doubtless mentioned expressly in a previous passage, of which we have now no record, (2) his own interpretation of said text and (3) the interpretation of it derived from oral tradition. It is obvious, too, that this written collection of Our Lord's oracles were held in high estimation by Papias, otherwise he would not have taken the trouble to comment on it. But our author hastens to rejoin that Papias asserts in the same context that "he gained no such profit from the contents of books as he did from the living and abiding voice," and so that he despised these books and would not have commented on them. This statement, we contend, conveys no reflection on the written records of the oracles, because Papias was well acquainted with St. Matthew's written account of them (for our present argument it does not matter whether or not his St. Matthew was different from ours), and it is incredible that he would have preferred that author's views through tradition, that is to say, at second hand. And again he tells us that St. Mark made no mistake in writing down what St. Peter said. How, then, could he prefer a hearsay version of that Apostle's preaching? Another proof of the same fact is sometimes given, viz.: That Eusebius did not understand this disparaging remark of Papias as reflecting on the Gospels, but this is to prejudge the identity (in the mind of Eusebius) of the oracles of Matthew and Mark (spoken of by Papias) without first two synoptics. The written source of Gospel history that Papias had before his mind, and which he held to be of little account, was probably a commentary on the Gospels by the Gnostics, for Irenæus upbraids the teachers of these sects as having tampered with the oracles of the Lord and having shown themselves bad expositors of things well said.

So far we have proved irrefragably that Papias instead of making a new compilation of the oracles simply wanted to supply a correct interpretation of a written compilation of them already in existence and of some authority.

Is there any evidence to show that this compilation was identical with our Gospels? There is convincing evidence in the fragments of Papias' work preserved for us by Eusebius that it included our First and Second Gospels at least. For says Papias: "This also the presbyter John[11] said; Mark having become the interpreter of

[11] It is not certain whether this John was the Apostle or not. Papias says he was a disciple of the Lord. (Eusebius, L. III., c. 39.)

Peter, wrote accurately whatever he remembered, though he did not arrange in order the things which were either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him; but afterwards, as I said, accompanied Peter, who adapted his teaching to the occasion and not as making a consecutive record of the Lord's oracles. Mark therefore committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembers them." Now the question we have to decide is the identity of the work thus described with our second canonical Gospel, for our St. Mark, unlike the work described, would seem to be an orderly and accurate narrative of our Lord's life. But, on the contrary, our Gospel is in reality both incomplete and the events are not recorded in strict chronological order.

These two phenomena are explained by St. Mark's position and opportunities, which were necessarily limited. His work was composed from reminiscences of St. Peter's teaching, and this teaching was necessarily fragmentary and adapted to the immediate requirements of his hearers. St. Mark could not possess either the materials for a complete account or the knowledge for an accurate chronological arrangement. As evidence of St. Mark's deficiency in these two particulars, "it will be sufficient," says Lightfoot, "to call attention to the fact that any of our other canonical Gospels records many doings and, above all, many sayings which are omitted by him, and hence it is by far the shortest of the four." As regards order, again it may, I believe, safely be said that no writer of a life of Christ finds himself in a position to preserve the sequence of events as it stands in St. Mark. His narrative does not profess to be strictly chronological. The order of time, no doubt, is observed here and there, but throughout a considerable portion of Our Lord's ministry the events are recorded quite irrespective of chronological considerations. But, responds our author, it does not depart in any important degree from the order of the other two synoptics. But here he can be hoist with his own petard and that of his friends, for they are forever proclaiming that the contradictions of the Synoptics make them utterly untrustworthy. Besides, Papias might have the Gospel of St. John (who was his master) in mind exclusively, and from him, of course, St. Mark differs toto coelo.

So far we have established the possibility that the two works were identical, but our great positive argument lies in the utter improbability of this important work of Mark and Peter having completely disappeared, as it must have done if it differed from our Second Gospel. Our author deprecates the discussion of this question and says it is no business of his to account for its disappearance. But surely this attitude of his is in the last degree shocking to the critical

sense. How Christian apologists would be sneered at if they considered it unnecessary to account for the placing of certain books on the canon or to reconcile their apparent discrepancies. We then will not let him shirk the difficulty, and for once will be more critical than the critics themselves. "Honest and painstaking inquirers will observe," says Lightfoot, "that not the faintest indication of this other Mark can be traced in all the remains of Christian antiquity. They will observe that if the date which our author himself adopts be correct, Irenæus was already grown up to manhood when Papias wrote. They will remember that Irenæus received his earliest education from a friend of Papias, and that his sources of information in everything that related to Christian tradition are the associates and friends of Papias." They will remark that having the work of Papias before him and holding it in high esteem, he none the less is so impressed with the conviction that our present four Gospels, and those only, have formed the title deeds of our religion from the beginning, that he is ever on the search for analogies to the sacred number; and all the time we are asked to believe that he was ignorant of, or despised, the authentic views of the prince of the Apostles as to the beginning of Christianity and which were embodied in the work of St. Mark referred to by Papias. This same conviction of Irenæus, who represented the tradition both of Asia Minor and of Gaul as to the four-fold number of the Gospels, was shared by the author of the Muratorian fragment, by Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian in Africa. The inference from all this is clear as the noonday sun, viz.: that the St. Mark of Papias was, in the opinion of these fathers and in reality, none other than our Second Gospel. None but those as jealous as the author for the supremacy of reason could withstand the converging testimony from so many different sources.

Coming now to St. Matthew, Papias says that "Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew language and every one translated them as he was able." There can be no doubt, and we are happy to agree with our author for once, that the Greek in this passage means "translated," and not merely "commented on;" and there can be as little doubt that being in the aorist tense, the translations by individuals were no longer made when Papias wrote. And the only reason for this could be that some universally recognized and authentic Greek translation existed at that time. I need not call your attention to how perfectly all this tallies with the Catholic tradition about our First Gospel. If it be contended, as it is, that this Aramaic original by St. Matthew and its recognized Greek translation have nothing to say to our canonical Gospel, the same argument against their complete disappearance, in the rationalistic hypothesis,

can be employed totiden verbis that we employed in the case of St. Mark. The argument is even stronger here, for two works are supposed to have totally disappeared. Such a supposition is so weighted with improbabilities that reason utterly revolts from its acceptance. This being the case, we have an obvious answer to this statement of our author that "there is no linguistic precedent in the time of Papias for straining the word 'logia' to mean anything beyond a collection of sayings of Jesus which were estimated as oracular or divine, nor is there any reason for thinking that 'logia' was here used in any other sense." There is the best of reasons to strain the meaning of the phrase if it were necessary so as to include the events in our St. Matthew; for the entire disappearance of such a work in twenty years when the author of the Muratorian fragment wrote, would be simply miraculous. But, as it happens, there is no need to strain the meaning of the word, for it is frequently used in contemporary literature and even by Papias himself to include events as well as discourses. For instance, the Scriptures which Ephraim of Antioch recognized consisted of the old Testament "ta kyriaka logia," and the preaching of the Apostles where "logia" is obviously a synonym for the Gospels. Again, in Romans iii., 2, the word is used, and the Apostle explaining his contention in the next chapter depends much more on the narrative of God's general dealing with the Hebrews than in His mere words to them. Again, in Hebrews v., 12, where he speaks of the first principles of the oracles of God, he elicits the divine teaching quite as much from the history as from the direct precepts of the Old Testament. But above all Papias himself, in the few fragments that have reached us, uses "logia" in the more extended sense where he says that St. Mark "wrote . . . not consecutively, because," he says, "St. Peter in his preaching did not give a consecutive narrative of the oracles of the Lord." In this passage things said or done by Christ and the oracles of the Lord evidently mean the same thing. Curiously enough, however, our author does not admit this, for he contends that the two expressions are contrasted in this passage. But if Mark wrote the things said and done as the interpreter of Peter, as Papias says, and as our author apparently admits, it would be impossible for him to be ignorant of the oracles of the Lord as expounded by St. Peter, for every one must admit that the oracles embrace the "things said" at least. Hence the point of the quotation is not a contrast between the things said and done and the oracles, but a simple explanation of the want of order in St. Mark's work. The meaning of "logia" in the vocabulary of Papias will become even clearer when we remember that he applies it to the narrative of Christ's life given by St. Peter to the Romans. For

surely it would be absurd to suppose that the addresses of the Apostle to them consisted merely of Our Lord's discourses; beyond all question he must have mentioned miracles and signs, and those of the highest order, as the authentic vouchers for the value and authority of these discourses, unless indeed one adopted our author's theory, on which I animadverted in the beginning, as to the total want of evidential value in miracles during the first ages of the Church.

Hence I think I have disposed of the objection that Papias cannot have referred to our St. Matthew, because "ta logia" simply means discourses, for I have shown that it means, on the contrary, a collection of the sayings and doings of Christ such as we have chronicled in our First Gospel

David Barry.

Limerick, Ireland.

A CATHOLIC VIEW OF HAMLET.

ÆSTHETIC criticism, the analysis and criticism both of the character of Hamlet and of the motive of his intellectual parent, Shakespeare, have gone to such lengths in this oftenest quoted and most misunderstood play that many, in disgust, have ruled out æsthetic criticism altogether as unscientific and unprofitable. However, like the ghost in Macbeth, this spirit will not always down, and it will be found with classes of students, to make the question a practical one, that what most interests them, and also, it may be added, aids to the formation of their character, is, not so much the study of grammatical forms and philological curiosities, but just these questions that are understood under the head of æsthetic criticism.

Briefly, there are two schools of critics—Goethe, Coleridge and Schlegel to represent the old school, now called the subjective, and the modern, objective school, ably represented by Professor Dowden, Professor Corson and, best of all, by our only eminent Catholic commentator, the late and talented but now little known George H. Miles, of Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg. His "Review of Hamlet," perhaps the most scholarly and finished literary exposition of Hamlet in modern times, published originally in the *Southern Review,* has long been out of print. Very few copies are now in existence, and it is practically unknown except in the stray quotations which the eye may chance upon among the footnotes of the New Variorum Shakespeare. The pity is that no Catholic student has apparently displayed any sorrow for its loss, Catholic teachers and

Catholic students resting content with Protestant interpretation of the most glorious products of Catholic thought in sixteenth century literature. Yet Goethe, Coleridge and Schlegel were utterly mistaken in Hamlet's character. He was to one or other of them a weak, vacillating creature, without a plan, a mouther of words, a procrastinator in action, pushed on by events and only accomplishing his one aim in life by a mere accident at the close.

Goethe expressed his opinion in Wilhelm Meister: "When the ghost has vanished, who is it we see standing before us? A young hero panting for vengeance? No! Amazement and sorrow overwhelm the solitary young man." Again: "Here is an oak tree planted in a costly vase, which should have received into its bosom only lovely flowers; the roots spread out, the vase is shivered to pieces . . . a beautiful pure and most moral nature, without the strength of nerve which makes a hero, sinks beneath a burden which it can neither bear nor throw off; every duty is holy to him, this too hard."

Schlegel tells us that his far-fetched scruples are often mere pretexts to cover up his want of determination, and Coleridge: "Hamlet is brave and careless of death, but he vacillates from sensibility and procrastinates from thought and loses the power of action in the energy of resolve." So far the subjective school. Hamlet is weak, more of a dreamer than doer, delaying action till action is of no use. The oak tree and vase of Goethe crystallizes the critical and popular estimate of Hamlet. So said George Miles of his day, while he reminds us that the Hamlet of the critic is not the Hamlet of Shakespeare; that a close review of the play will show that Hamlet is strong; that the basis of his character is strength; that his acts and utterances manifest power; slow, cautious, capricious perhaps, but always strong, always large-souled, always resistless.

Modern critics of the type of Dowden and Corson and, among the text-book editors, Hudson, Rolfe, the editors of the Riverside Literature Series and of the Arden Press "Hamlet," the standard texts, generally in the hands of teachers and students, all these discard the subjective view we have above exposed. No modern would wish Hamlet to wade through slaughter to a throne without questioning the morality of his act, to the satisfaction and ease of his own conscience or without concern for the tremendous scandal his precipitate action would give to those of his kingdom who could not by any means appreciate the lawfulness of his deed had he accomplished it in the summary way our friends of the subjective school of critics would desire. Yet even in the modern books mentioned there is not enough to show that Hamlet's plan was fashioned on anything higher than a natural motive; nay, not enough to show that it was

not founded on a very low motive of revenge. The Rev. Henry Hudson on page 22 of his introduction complains that the critics talk "just as if it were a mattery lying solely between Hamlet and Claudius, just as if the people of Denmark had nothing to say, no rights involved, no concern in the question. Hamlet does not see it so. Every lover of his kind naturally desires both in life and death the good opinion of his kind, and so Hamlet has a just, a benevolent and an honorable concern as to what the world may think of him." So he says:

> O God, Horatio! what a wounded name,
> Things standing thus unknown, shall live behind me!
> If ever thou didst hold me in thy heart,
> Absent thee from felicity awhile,
> And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain,
> To tell my story.

This is well and good. Hamlet did have this desire, but also a higher and better, as we shall see. To the question, "why the poet does not make Hamlet strike," Mr. Hudson makes better answer: "Shakespeare portrays many great criminals, men and women, too, who for a while ride in triumph over virtue wronged, persecuted, crushed. And he always brings them to punishment, so far as this world can punish them, but he never in a single instance does this till their crimes are laid open to the world, so that all about them recognize the justice of their fate and are righteously glad at what befalls them. . . . The very nature and idea of a proper tragic revenge or retribution require that the guilty be not put to death till their guilt has beeen proved, and so proved that the killing of them shall be manifestly a righteous act, shall stand to the heart and conscience of mankind as an act of solemn and awful justice. To such a revenge—the only revenge that Hamlet can execute or ought to execute; the only revenge, too, consistent with the genius of the work—to such a revenge punishment is necessary; to punishment justice is necessary; to justice the vindication of it in the eyes, not merely of the theatre, but of those among whom the action takes place." This is better, higher and nobler, but it does not tell us whether Hamlet was guided by this motive, knew and followed the supernatural leading. *I must bide my time until I know that my act is right in the eyes of God.*

Rolfe's edition is more satisfactory, though the editor does not venture his own views. The excerpt from the London *Quarterly Review* for 1847 comes nearer our idea of conscience. "Hell, whose support he rejects, is forever returning to the mind and startling his conscience. It is this that makes him wish for the confirmation of the play, for evil spirits may have abused him. It is this which begets the apathy he terms oblivion, for inaction affords relief to

doubt. It is this which produces his inconsistencies, for conscience calls him different ways, and when he obeys in one direction he is haunted by a feeling that he should have gone in the other." We shall prove presently that Hamlet did not delay so very much, after all. Mr. Rolfe quotes at great length from Professor Dowden, the celebrated modern critic. Agreeing in great part with his conclusions, we cannot be so favorable to the following: "This long course of thinking, apart from action, has destroyed Hamlet's very capacity for belief, since in belief there exists a certain element contributed by the will." Again: "All through the play he wavers between materialism and spiritualism; between belief in immortality and disbelief; between reliance upon Providence and a bowing under fate." According to this critic Hamlet is not incapable of vigorous action if only he be allowed another chance of thinking the facts away into an idea.

The Riverside Literature Series of Houghton Mifflin is inflicting upon the country the interpretation that conscience, in "thus conscience doth make cowards of us all," means only consciousness or too much thinking. In treating "The Hesitation of Hamlet," Helen Gray Cone, the editor of this edition, does not give her own conclusion. Any reader, she says, who believes with Mr. Hudson that Shakespeare regards the ghost's injunction as a temptation to crime, logically ascribes the singular hesitation of Hamlet to a moral scruple. But those who believe that revenge is here treated in a conventional manner only, hold that this very hesitation of the hero is itself the real theme of the play and has its source either in Hamlet's intellectual constitution or in the peculiar phase of human experience through which he is passing. Now if Hamlet as a tragedy of a high order and the outgrowth of Shakespeare's maturer judgment, founded on his own experience of life, is to conform to Matthew Arnold's definition of poetry as a criticism of life and fulfil its three canons of seriousness and truth as well as of liquid verse, the revenge, it would seem, must be treated in a more than conventional manner. Even the casual reader of Shakespeare cannot but be struck by the marked difference that exists between the lighter, more youthful, conventional plays of his earlier years, such as "Love's Labor Lost" and "Midsummer Night's Dream," and the riper, more serious, truer representations of life in the "Merchant of Venice," "Hamlet" and the crown of his whole life work, "King Lear" and "The Tempest." When he was writing these great plays he was treating life as it is in reality, not judging by its outer rind. If this be true, the revenge scheme in "Hamlet" should be treated in more than a conventional way, and Hamlet should reflect in the words of the play, in his thought and his act the living man of flesh and blood

in all the circumstances in which Shakespeare supposes him to be placed, of the period in which he is supposed to have lived and the religious principles by which he was governed.

This, then, is the constructive part of our subject, and for clearness sake we may consider the following points: At what period of the world is this Hamlet supposed to exist? According to the ethics of his time was such an act as his allowable? How long did he delay the accomplishment of it? What is there in the play to show that he was guided by the motive of his religion?

It must be conceded that Hamlet is believed by a certain class of critics to-day to be the incarnation of Protestantism. It is held that Shakespeare wishes to hold up the mirror of Hamlet's soul to the world and let all men see therein the inconsistencies and doubts, the darkling ways of a soul around whom Protestantism has thrown its fatal net of private judgment, skepticism and despair. With them he is always "divided in the swift mind," in act to do, never doing; of him, say they, the words of the King are true:

> Like a man to double business bound,
> I stand in pause where I shall first begin.

It may be so, but if so, it can only be a secondary thread in the woof of Hamlet's character, not at all interfering with the great general scheme of the whole frabric. Shakespeare can scarcely have intended this Titanic play to be a mere burlesque or comedy of Protestantism. This theory is built up, first, on the modern text, which was not Shakespeare's text, as finally approved by him and, secondly, on the assumption that Hamlet dawdled and delayed. We shall see how long precisely Hamlet idled.

Wittenberg is a fortified town of Prussian Saxony on the right bank of the Elbe, on the railway from Berlin to Leipsic. Its university, founded in 1502, was transferred to Halle in 1815. It was the cradle of the Reformation. The Augustinian monastery, now in ruins, had been Luther's home; in the university he was a professor, and on the door of one of its churches he nailed his theses. There, in 1520, Luther burned the Pope's bull of excommunication, and in its *schlosskirche* he is buried, with Melancthon and their common friends, the Electors Frederick and John. In its narrow, tortuous streets Hamlet is supposed to have walked and read and pondered, as we see him reading and pondering in the play, yet it is in the irony of fate that the hero of the greatest tragedy of the English stage, by an anacronism of more than five hundred years, should have been made a student within its Protestant walls, without ever reflecting in all his glorious bursts of intellectuality a single one of its doctrines. We might explore the great caves of thought and

torrents of eloquence in vain to discover one adulterate drop of false doctrine. Protestantism was to have no such herald—the only mention of her system may be one of scorn:

> There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in our philosophy.

This Hamlet is supposed to have been a student at Wittenberg; in reality, the play is written of a much earlier period. It is founded on the work of Saxo Grammaticus, a Danish historian, written as early as 1204. The scene of the earlier work is laid in Denmark, before the introduction of Christianity and at a period when England was under the sway of the Danish hordes. In Shakespeare's hands the personages of the old tale have all been Christianized with the feelings, thoughts and actions of the early Christian times preceding the Norman conquest, when, however, England still recognized the suzerainty of the Danish crown. Hamlet may, nay, does, reflect in his speech the social and intellectual life in England of a very much later period still—indeed of the dramatist's own day. Nevertheless, as he stands, Hamlet is Catholic Prince of Denmark, sole heir to the throne of a murdered father, barred from his succession by an adulterous uncle, who, as the play reads, to all Denmark save only Hamlet, appears the lawful King; for the customs of the times, had the marriage been lawfully brought about, would have recognized the succession of Claudius before that of the younger Hamlet. Mr. Hudson, in what is perhaps the most widely known text-book we have, states that Claudius holds the crown by the same legal title and tenure as Hamlet's father had it. This is not true, if it means that this "King of shreds and patches" is lawful King. The kingship question cannot be so easily settled out of hand. The same editor continues: "The Danish Crown was partly elective, partly hereditary; elective within the circle of a particular family and kindred; the hereditary right belongs to the Queen. She was the only child of the former King, and Hamlet's father was brought within the circle of elegibility by his marriage with her." So far so good. "Of course, when her first husband died and she married a second, the second became eligible just as the first had done." This last statement is certainly not correct in the case under discussion.

Claudius, supposing the Christian character of the Danish Court, was not and could not have become King of Denmark by this marriage, even were he free of the charges of treason and homicide. It was within the forbidden degrees. The prohibition among the Saxons[1] had been extended at the commencement of the eleventh

[1] Lingard, "The Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church," First American Edition, c. vii., p. 133.

century to the sixth degree, and there is no reason for supposing a difference in legislation for the Danes. Moreover, the words of Claudius in the play assure us that he was fully aware of the unlawfulness of this union.

Again, the Queen was now, by Church law, inhabilitated for another lawful marriage. The dispensation would not have been granted without urgent necessity, and there was no such necessity, with Hamlet ready to succeed. If the Witan confirmed Claudius without Church dispensation, as the play seems to indicate, this would have meant a rebellion against the Church discipline, of which there is absolutely no mention in the play, and would have been an extremely unlikely occurrence. Had Hamlet died in the ordinary course of nature and there were no second marriage, the Witan would have given the preference to the younger Hamlet, according to the custom of the time. This would make Claudius an usurper and Hamlet the legitimate King-elect, only wanting the voice of the Witan to assume the kingly dignity. That the Witan has approved the marriage and accepted Claudius as King, without reference to Church laws, seems not to have troubled the dramatist, who was more concerned, no doubt, for the canons of dramatic art than for the requirements of canon law. That the Danish throne professed obedience to the See of Rome is clear from all the burial proceedings of the last act. The inconsistency must be laid at Shakespeare's door.

All these considerations brand Claudius as an usurper, but at the same time do not, by any means, justify Hamlet in taking the law into his own hands by inflicting the death-stroke. That penalty was reserved for the Witan. "The Witan chose the King and could depose him; they could freely elect him from the family ruling by hereditary succession. A certain preference was given to first sons of crowned Kings, to prominent characters or to members recommended by the dying King. The Witanagemot was the court of justice in the last resort and could impose banishment, outlawry and capital punishment."[2] To Horatio, before that terrible final scene, summing up all his arguments, Hamlet asks: "Is it not perfect conscience to kill him with this arm?" Neither Horatio nor Shakespeare have answered that question. Madness or a very false conception of duty alone could free him from formal guilt.

Before passing to the question of the delay in following out the ghost's demand, we may remark that much of the false criticism of Hamlet as a weak and vacillating character is built upon the modern text which is an amalgamation of the Second Quarto and the Folio

[2] Guggenberger, "General History of the Christian Era," Vol. I., Sect. 299, p. 192.

of 1623. But the text in our hands to-day is not Shakespeare's text. The last text approved by Shakespeare and used as the acting copy was the Folio of 1623, and in that folio many passages are omitted which now are relied upon as intrinsic proof of Hamlet's weakness of character.

The question of the delay is interesting.[3] Some have thought that the play covers a period of ten years. This certainly would make of Hamlet an irretrievable dreamer. But let us see. The tragedy opens at midnight and continues until dawn, and at its close Marcellus says of Hamlet:

> I this morning know
> Where we shall find him most convienently.

In scene 2 Horatio says of the ghost:

> My lord, I think I saw him yesternight.

And Hamlet says:

> I'll watch to-night . . .

This watch is given in scenes 4 and 5, while scene 3 occupies the day before the night comes on. The first act, therefore, occupies one day and two nights. Between the first and second act the one delay occurs for which Hamlet can be held strictly to account. In all, it was little more than two months. In the first act we are told that Hamlet the elder was

> But two months dead, nay, not so much, not two.

In the third act the time since his death is stated to be "twice two months." The period of delay, therefore, was not so long as a first reading would lead one to suppose. But what had he done during this time? His studied plan had been to fall

> Into a sadness, then into a fast,
> Thence to a lightness, and by this declension
> Into the madness wherein now he raves,
> And all we mourn for.

Partly true, Polonius; but we in the audience who know Hamlet in the broad landscape view of his character, all the hills and valleys, sunlit streams and dark flowing rivers of thought, all the shade and sunshine, know well that it was all feigned. "I must be idle," said he, the word *idle* meaning *mad*. To be a madman requires no art, but to feign one needs a master. We can forgive Hamlet if he took more than "a little month" to accomplish it. He had to change his countenance before them, as David before Achis in the days of yore, or as the young nobles feigned madness in the arena in the early Roman days.

[3] The Bankside Shakespeare, Vol. XI., "Hamlet," Introduction, p. xxiii., etc.

All this had Hamlet to do lest the King should pluck the heart out of his mystery while he was awaiting his chance to catch the conscience of the King. The wicked Claudius, with Hamlet, alone of all Denmark, knew of the former's crime, for the ghost we cannot strictly call an inhabitant of Denmark. Surely two months was not too long a time to wring the confession from the murderer's lips, to save his mother's soul, to prove his cause aright to the unsatisfied. Many a man nowadays, with all the appliances of law to boot, would take much longer to prove his cause without being branded a weak dreamer. Hamlet's best answer to those who consider him a procrastinator, a dawdler, or a mere thinker are his words to his mother:

> Forgive me this my virtue,
> For in the fatness of these pursy times
> Virtue itself of vice must pardon beg.
> It would have been vice to act, it was virtue to delay.

There is one more interval of any moment, that between scenes 3 and 4 of the fourth act. This time has been calculated thus: In the last scene there are named pansies, columbines, daisies, crow flowers, nettles and long purples, flowers which in England, of which Shakespeare speaks rather than of Denmark, are in bloom during the month of April. The time of Polonius' death, on the other hand, is fixed with beautiful precision by the words of Ophelia:

> I would give you some violet, but they withered all when my father died.

It is in March that the English violets bloom and pass away. The tragedy, therefore, ends in April; during the month of March Polonius was slain; the action began two months or a little more before that time, or during the first half of the month of January, at a time when "the air bites shrewdly, it is very cold;" about two months before this, or early in November, the murder took place, and in December the marriage. For thirty days the ghost said not a word to Hamlet, and why? Marcellus tells us:

> Ever 'gainst that season comes
> Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated.
> The bird of dawning singeth all night long,
> And then they say no spirit dare stir abroad.

It was not, therefore, until after the Christmas holidays that the ghost of Hamlet's father could bring his message from the grave. Two months then, the interval between act 1 and 2, is the true measure of Hamlet's delay. After Polonius' death he was a prisoner.

And what had Hamlet to do during these two months, and what did he accomplish? A giant's task indeed! The promptest man of action could not have made a speedier end of his work. A veritable knight of mind and tongue and sword! "All the flash and motion of

Geraint," says Miles, in every word and thought and deed. The play opens with his suspicion, "I have that within which passeth show"—absolutely nothing but suspicion.

> It is not, nor it cannot come to good;
> But break my heart, for I must hold my tongue.

The ghost appears, the injunction is given and Hamlet, afire with knightly indignation, cries:

> Murder . . .
> Haste me to know't that I, with winds as swift
> As meditation or the thoughts of love,
> May sweep to my revenge.

He is ready, sword in hand, till the voice of faith, in that ghostly spirit, whispers back:

> Howsoe'r thou pursuest this act,
> Taint not thy mind, nor let thy soul contrive
> Against thy mother ought.

Faith and filial affection win. During the rest of the play those two Christian duties are clear before him. He must not act until he has devised a plan to catch the conscience of the King.

> I'll have these players
> Play something like the murder of my father,
> Before mine uncle: I'll observe his looks;
> I'll tent him to the quick; if he but blench,
> I know my course. The spirit, that I have seen,
> May be the devil: and the devil hath power
> To assume a pleasing shape; yea, and, perhaps,
> Out of my weakness, and my melancholy
> (As he is very potent with such spirits),
> Abuses me to damn me: I'll have grounds
> More relative than this: the play's the thing,
> Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king.

About eighty years before the days of Shakespeare St. Ignatius of Loyola had written: "It is peculiar to the bad angel, transfiguring himself into an angel of light, to enter with the devout soul and to come out his own way . . . by drawing the soul into his secret snares and perverse intentions." Was this more than a coincidence?

Is Hamlet weak and irresolute? From the moment he realizes that his life, in the outcome, is doomed, that he will never come forth alive from the terrible disaster he foresees, he sacrifies his affection for Ophelia outright and forever. Was this weak? Is he seeking after justice or rather indulging a brutal lust for revenge in his ambition for kingship? When those conventional euphuistic nobodies—Rosencrantz and Guildenstein—try to play upon him, to know his stops, to pluck out the heart of his mystery on this very point of ambition, he turns to them: "O, God, I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a King of infinite space." And revenge? How is it the first act closes, after the interview with the ghost?

> That ever I was born to set it right!
> O cursed spite

No mere brutal animal craving for revenge there. The word revenge in his mouth and in his play, as he saw it, spelled justice. In his grand soliloquy Hamlet tells us that he bears the whips and scorns of time, the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, pangs of disprized love, the law's delay—not the delay of a vacillating mind for the pleasure of building castles in the air and the baseless fabric of dreams, as some would have it, but the law's delay—that which was required to report his case aright, to have grounds more relative than were his at the start, to make assurance doubly sure; and why? Because of the dread of something after death; because conscience does make cowards of us all, and thus the native hue of resolution common to the good and bad; enterprises of great pith and moment, which might be either morally good or bad, with this regard their currents turn awry and lose the name of precipitate and thoughtless action.

After the interlude, when the King's conscience has been caught and he rises in dismay, crying, "Give o'er the play," Hamlet says, "I'll take the ghost's word for a thousand pounds," and to Horatio: "Did'st perceive?" *Horatio:* "Very well, my Lord," and, while they are speaking enter Rosencrantz and Guildenstern with, "The Queen, your mother, . . . desires to speak with you," and Hamlet, "We shall obey, were she ten times our mother." On the way he passes the King at prayer, and this passage is the only objection to our lofty view of Hamlet's intent:

> Now might I do it, pat, now he is praying;
> And now I'll do it; and so he goes to heaven.

But then:

> Why, this is hire and salary, not revenge . . .
> To take him in the purging of his soul . . .
> Up, sword; and know thou a more horrid hent;
> When he is drunk, asleep, or in his rage; . . .
> At gaming, swearing; or about some act
> That has no relish of salvation in't:
> Then trip him, that his heels may kick at heaven;
> And that his soul may be as damn'd, and black,
> As hell, whereto it goes.

But this is not Hamlet's true motive. We must remember he said, a moment before, when referring to the coming conference with his mother: "Now could I drink hot blood, and do such. . . . I will speak daggers to her, but use none." The last will give us the cue to his true character. "My mother stays." It would serve no purpose in the work of saving his mother's soul, to which he has pledged himself, to come to her red with the blood of her husband's brother.

Hamlet as Shakespeare gives him to us is a Catholic Prince of the eleventh century. Let us view him through Catholic eyes. Let

us judge him by Catholic principles. When the ghost first crosses his path, that frosty night under the stars, he breaks into prayer, "Angels and ministers of grace defend us." When again it comes to sharpen his blunt purpose, while in conference with his mother, he meets it with a prayer, "Save me and hover over me, you heavenly guards." He has been condemned for weakness and scrupulosity; but the scruple comes after the act. Hamlet's hesitancy is before, and is immediately dictated by faith counseling the good, bidding him be wary and cautious lest the evil one abuse him to damn him. He will not be cozened by this foul fiend, for the devil hath power to assume a pleasing shape. The motive of faith as the main influence in Hamlet's hesitancy throughout this play every Protestant critic seems to have completely ignored. Can it be ignored? Hamlet has an after life to look to. *That* puzzles his will. Were this a Greek tragedy, all well and good. Let Œdipus be pushed on by fate, and death and the grave will end all. We shall not look for him beyond. "When the grave is the consummation," wrote Miles, "the absolute finale of existence, it is easy to round the heroic evenly and symmetrically up to that margin. But when death is the door to vaster spheres and wider experiences; when this little life is but the prelude to unending futurities of infinite bliss or infinite despair, the deeper faith should find its echo in deeper art. In Hamlet, as in Faust, more grandly, though less avowedly, the immortal weal or woe of the human soul is at stake, and we catch ourselves listening for the spirit voices at the end: 'He is judged, he is saved.'"

The fact that his act was altogether unjustifiable and reserved to the supreme assembly of the land does not rob his previous conduct of the higher motives ascribed to it. He erred in the conception of his duty, and his hesitancy was dictated by the faith that was in him to learn whether he was prompted to his revenge by heaven or by hell. A true Catholic Hamlet would have been saved all this anxious hesitancy by the recourse to a spiritual adviser, and in this, at least, his conduct exemplifies the blind paths in which he strays who relies on private judgment in matters of faith and morals. The material fashioned by Shakespeare into this great drama of retribution was the chronicle of a day of blood before the dawn of Christianity in Northern Europe, when might was right. For the sake of the world of literary and moral good opened up to us in this play, we may pardon him if at times in the broad, clear light of Hamlet's soul one may still detect here and there a shadow of pre-Christian barbarism.

William Devlin, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS CHRIST.

"Valeur de L'Assemblée qui prononça la Peine de Mort Confre Jesus-Christ." Par MM. Les Abbés Lemann. (Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1877, third ed.)

A BOOK appeared not long ago that excited a good deal of attention and raised what may be called a reserved and reverent curiosity, the tone of which left nothing to be desired. An Italian writer treated of the trial of Jesus, analyzing the evidence and all its parts in view of the conclusion that the final sentence was illegal. No doubt the subject of this book was not quite so novel as it was supposed to be. It must, indeed, have occurred, no doubt, to many legal minds in former ages. Acute intellects must have taken a comprehensive view of all the facts. The general opinion of all Christian peoples is enough to know that the condemnation of Jesus was long ago reprobated and rejected as unjust. Was it technically illegal? This is the question, strictly speaking, reserved for our times. Were the forms of justice observed? Was the trial "according to law?" On the ground of equity, there was never any doubt on the subject The ground of legality had equally to be cleared and made plain. The writer in question weighed all the points and drew the conclusion that Jesus Christ was not condemned either by equity or by law. The subject and the book were noticed in many journals as if they were entirely new. The work now before us, which I propose to consider, anticipated the recent Italian writer's by many years. The subject is not, however, quite the same, for whereas the Italian author treated of the proceedings at the trial, the writers under consideration took the ground of considering the legal powers and rights of the assembly that issued the sentence. They strike at the root of the authority that took to itself the conduct of the trial and condemnation. In this respect their work goes deeper than that of the Italian author and demands a greater amount of learning and research.

As we see, this work was published many years back. Thirty years ago it was in its third edition. It was written apparently by converted Jews, to judge by their name.

This work is divided into two parts. The first is called "Valeur des Personnes;" the second is called "Valeur des Actes." The "assemblée" or tribunal is the famous Sanhedrin, or great council of the Jewish nation. The authors describe the rise and vigor of the Sanhedrin. As they impressively say: "Among the assemblies which are responsible to posterity, there is one which bears an exceptional responsibility; it is the assembly which presided over the last

days of the national life of the Jewish people. It was this that arraigned and condemned Jesus Christ."

The name Sanhedrin, we are told, pronounced before the Jews, was enough to remind them of the most learned, most equitable and most honorable assembly that ever existed. It was reverenced and loved. No one dared to impugn its decisions or question its rights. But, the authors say, the Jewish veneration had become tainted with ignorance. The Sanhedrin rested largely on prescription; its history and its rights were lost in the mist of antiquity. Its decisions, therefore, were founded in great part on common law, when just; when unjust, were based on doubtful rules and traditions.

At the time of Christ the Sanhedrin occupied a peculiar position derived from the peculiar state of the Jews themselves. The people were half free and half captives, half Roman and half Jewish, half national and half foreign. Their state of subjection was varnished over with a pretense of freedom, and a dignified show occupied a throne in opposition to the authority of Rome.

The Sanhedrin, or great council, was the high court of justice, the supreme tribunal of the Jews. It was established at Jerusalem after the Babylonish captivity. The famous council of seventy elders instituted by Moses was its model. By reason of this resemblance the rabbins pretended that it was the same council; but this was evidently an exaggeration. The council of Moses lasted but a short time, and it disappeared on the entrance of the people into the Promised Land. The Sanhedrin of the second epoch, as we may call it, appeared in the age of the Macchabees. From this fact we may judge of its age. The word Sanhedrin is Greek, and means an assembly of members in session, and this is enough to negative its claim to a remote antiquity, for it was born of the union between Palestine and Greece, which certainly existed not in the age of Moses. It was composed of seventy-one members with the President (Josephus). At the time of Christ these seventy-one were divided into three chambers—the Priests, the Scribes and Doctors and the Ancients. The Chamber of Priests was composed of those who enjoyed sacerdotal rank. The Chamber of the Scribes and Doctors was composed of the Levites and lay persons versed in the law. The Chamber of the Ancients was composed of the most considerable men of the nation outside of the other two ranks. The Sanhedrin had authority in matters of life and death. It could, however, only pronounce sentence in one court in Jerusalem, situated in a part of the temple. The Sanhedrin, having power of life and death, had, nevertheless, suffered a serious limitation of its powers, according to our authors, twenty-three years before the trial of Jesus. When Judea was made a Roman province under

Augustus, the Sanhedrin lost its rights over life and death. This fact has not only been overlooked, but it has been suppressed by the Jews and ignored in every way possible. The Jews have in a great degree successfully concealed it. The *jus gladii* was taken away from the Sanhedrin. It kept the right to imprison, to condemn, to scourging; but the right to decree death it lost. This was a great blow, and the contemporaneous Jews did all they could to assist the Sanhedrin in concealing and disguising this loss of power. Rabbi Rachmon is quoted as depicting the event as one of general mourning: "The members of the Sanhedrin covered their heads with ashes and clothed themselves in sackcloth, saying, 'Woe to us, for the sceptre has departed from Judea and the Messias has not come." They repeatedly tried to recover the power, pretending that although they had lost the power of executing sentences, they still had the right to pronounce them in religious affairs. This was an assumption and a delusion on their part.

The authors prove this point very clearly. They explain also why the Jews obstinately adhered to the shadow of a vanished right and pretended to a power they did not possess. The reason was because they refused to acknowledge the expiry of Judea's regal sceptre and the consequent obligation of bowing the knee to Jesus Christ. Their attitude was bound up in the advent of the Messias. Something must also be put down to the side of national pride, always so strong among the Jews. They looked back to a long past, to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to Moses and Josue, to Samuel and David; and they felt a pride and a consciousness of prerogatives which no other nation could realize in the same degree. They were the chosen people, and they knew it. If they had only realized also the conditions and principles of their having been so chosen, they would not be outcasts to-day among all nations.

Thus the judges of Christ were seventy-one, distributed into three chambers. Their names and characters throw great light upon the cause. Few of them have been hitherto known. We know Caiphas and Anna, and we know Pilate. As to the rest, no one thought of discovering their names. The documents, it was thought, were wanting. We have the Gospels, Josephus and the Talmud. We can now discover many of them.

The second part of this interesting work is entitled "Valeur des Actes" ("Value of the Acts of the Sanhedrin"). It must be presumed that I only give the substance of what the authors themselves relate, without in any way vouching for the accuracy of their assertions. They cite facts, as they say, to prove that the Sanhedrin was prejudiced and prepared to decree the death of Our Lord. The facts in support of this view are derived first from three decisions

of the Sanhedrin in three meetings previous to that held on Good Friday. The authors describe these meetings. The first is mentioned in John vii., 37-53. This issued in a decree of excommunication. There were in the law of the synagogue three degrees of excommunication—separation, execration, death. The last was reserved, as a rule, for false prophets.

The second assembly is described four and a half months after the first. This was on the occasion of the resurrection of Lazarus, John xi., 46-56. In this the death of Jesus was decided upon. It was decreed rashly, without examination or deliberation, hesitation or interrogation. The third assembly was held about twenty-five days after the second. It is described in Matthew xxvi., 3-5; Luke xxii., 1-3. In the assembly the time of Christ's death was settled and the manner of His arrest. All this is brought forward to prove that Jesus was not fairly tried, but that His enemies so arranged matters that He was pre-condemned and prejudged.

The authors next go on to consider the rules of justice and legal forms of obligation on the Sanhedrin in all criminal cases. It is very necessary, they say, that we should know the criminal legislation of the Jews. The Old Testament presents its principles, but much was carried on by tradition. This tradition is now to be found in the celebrated book, "The Mischna," the work of the Rabbi Juda, who lived at the end of the second century A. D., and was called the second law, or *Mischna.* It comprises sixty-three treatises, grouped under six titles. From this we learn the hours prescribed for every judicial sitting, under pain of nullity, viz.: It was forbidden to hold it on the Sabbath or feast day. It was forbidden on the eves of the Sabbath or feast day. It was forbidden to consider a capital charge at night. It was forbidden before the completion of the morning sacrifice. As regards the hearing of the witnesses, the following rules were enjoined: 1. There must be two witnesses. 2. The witnesses were to be separated from each other, but in the presence of the accused. 3. The witnesses must promise to tell the truth. 4. The Judge must listen attentively to the witnesses. 5. The witness is invalid unless the witnesses agree as regards the examinations of the accused; the attitude towards the accused was to be one of humanity and benevolence. The accused pleaded his own cause. Such is the summary of the rules regarding the administration of criminal justice. The authors proceed to show that these were violated in the trial of Jesus.

Two sittings were given to the trial of Jesus. The first was held at night, and is mentioned by SS. Matthew, Mark and John. The second, convoked in the morning of the same day, is indicated by St. Matthew and Mark (Matthew xxvi., Mark xiv.). "It was

night," says St. John. *"Erat autem nox"* (John xiii. and xvii.). This, the authors say, was the first irregularity. The meeting was held after the evening sacrifice. Second irregularity. It was the first day of the azures and eve of the great feast of the Pasch. Third irregularity. The fourth irregularity is found in the interrogation of Caiphas, *accuser* and *judge*. He had been the accuser (John xviii.). He could not lawfully be both. He did not call witnesses, but interrogated by accusing and by captious questioning. Fifth irregularity. The illegal blow is also to be noticed. Christ asks for witness on this occasion and appeals to His own public doctrine. In the deposition of witnesses these facts are to be observed. Christ had appealed for witnesses. Some appeared, but against them is the fatal record, "Many false witnesses" were brought forward (Mark xiv., Matthew xxvi.).

Then we have the second interrogation of Caiphas, "Dost thou reply nothing to these witnesses against thee?" (Mark xiv.) He replied not (Mark xiv., 61), and His silence was the most eloquent protest possible against their falsehoods and inventions. Then comes to pass the third interrogation of Caiphas: "I adjure thee by the living God to tell us if thou art Christ the Son of God" (Matthew xxvi., 63; Mark xiv., 61).

The scene was changed. No charge was further made, no witnesses appeared. This form of trial was quite invalid. Then the Chief Priest rent his garment, saying, "He hath blasphemed. What need have we of further testimony? You have heard the blasphemy. What think ye?" (Matthew xxvi., 65-66.) Another grave irregularity is thus to be ascribed to Caiphas. The Chief Priest was forbidden to tear his garments in this manner. (Levit. xxi., 10.) Further, two irregularities were committed in criminating the accused's answer before examining it, and the charge and sentence being compounded together. Caiphas anticipated the judgment of the other judges. The sentence was not given by the judges in order, but by them on the word of Caiphas alone, "He is worthy of death." (Matthew xxvi., 66; Mark xiv., 64.) Another irregularity was the neglect of the prescription of the law that the sentence was to be postponed till the next day. Such was this night sitting and its fatal issue.

In conclusion, the authors say: "In its *members* this Court of Assize presents us with an assembly of men in great part unworthy of their functions. No piety, no justice, no moral value can be seen; nor pity for the accused, nor grave deliberation of legal forms. In their *acts* there are twenty-seven irregularities, any one of which would make a fatal flaw in the proceedings."

I have given a brief summary of this interesting work because

it is written by authors apparently brought up in the Jewish traditions and habits of thought; because it is a book bearing upon a subject that has come prominently to the front of late, and because this book is unknown and has a claim to be known and valued beyond others of a more pretentious character.

The question here debated is whether the forms of justice were violated at Our Lord's trial or not? Such a theme must in the eyes of all be one of paramount importance. In the Gospels the trial as it stands is evidently one-sided and unfair. It is well to have this drawn out and made a subject of study for all.

WILFRID LESCHER, O. P.

Hinckley, England.

THE PROGRESS OF THOUGHT AND THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

IT HAS become a fashion of late, if indeed it be not a fashion nearly as old as the dogma which it professes to wish recast, to express a desire for a restatement of Christian truth upon lines in keeping with the rapid advance of modern science. Our language, as is natural in a vehicle that embodies and conveys a thought not so much really changing or developing as growing in completeness of detail, itself changes so rapidly and so continuously in its shades and gradations of meaning, that for a Christian dogma to be correctly grasped and even to be understood at all, it must be stated as clearly and as definitely as is possible in those terms in which we actually and habitually think. This is doubtless true, even to a marked extent in some cases, in the mere modification of meaning which a word insensibly undergoes in consequence of a long service in popular usage. But it is the more striking, and in some senses the less to be looked for, in those cases in which our old concepts of things have received, or seem to us to have received, a sudden shock; when our philosophy or our science has summarily closed an old, to open a new, road upon which, under pain of solecism, to say nothing of positive error, we are thenceforth to travel if we are ever to reach a true and human solution of the great problems as to the real nature and meaning of the universe or of our own place within it. The progress of the century just closed has done more to remodel and reconstitute our mental horizon than perhaps any other in the long history of the Christian era. The greatest impetus, possibly, to the popularization of a scientific terminology, though

certainly not at the same time to an outpouring of the true scientific spirit, was given by the French encyclopedists. The fascinating charm of the style in which the famous "Dictionnaire Raisonné" was written was doubtless the cause chiefly contributing to its popularity; but while the materialistic science it inculcated was absorbed into and spread through the literature of the period, it steadily sapped the vigor alike of science and of philosophy. As Merz has appositely pointed out, the brilliant literary work of the encyclopedists, the witty sarcasms of Voltaire, the irreverence, skepticism and flippancy of Diderot and D'Alembert, the scientific monism of Holbach, did nothing to advance the genuine spirit of scientific research and accuracy, while, on the other hand, it undoubtedly had the effect of slurring over that exactness of significance in precise terms and ideas which is the first requisite of all knowledge. Thus begun, the work developed under the hands of La Mettrie and Cabanis. "It is unnecessary to say," I quote one of the most sober and able of modern authors,[1] "that none of them had the sanction of their great masters for the application they made of principles which had been established and used for special scientific purposes. From his (Lange's "History of Materialism") exhaustive references, it is evident that the extreme views of La Mettrie, Diderot and Holbach cannot be fathered on any of the great scientists or philosophers." It was an attempt, foredoomed to logical failure, though emulating and attaining a certain degree of popular adhesion and applause, to apply scientific principles, true enough in their place and for the purposes of science, to political, ethical and religious problems. It did not register or record new discoveries in the realm of concrete experience; but it attempted to build a new edifice of interpretation upon the old.

Far different was the work of the real men of science—Lavoisier, Gay, Lussac and Pasteur, in France; Liebig, of Giessen; Schleiden, of Jena, and Schwann, of Louvain; Harvey, Bell, the English chemists and natural philosophers. If they, too, drew conclusions reaching sometimes beyond the borders of their actual experiment and observation, they at least advanced the true cause of science at the same time by the work they did. And, whatever the shortcomings of certain scientific hypotheses advanced may be when they are used in connection with problems for which they were not framed and to which they will not apply, no exception can reasonably be taken to them as long as they are urged in the name of science for scientific purposes and with all the safeguards of scientific limitation. The doctrine of chemical equivalents, the periodic law, the molecular,

[1] John Theodore Merz, "A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century."

atomic or electronic hypotheses, the discoveries connected with the phenomena of life and consciousness—the circulation of the blood and sensory and motor nerve action—the cellular theory in botany and in biology, the empiric work of Priestly, Cavendish, Dalton, Herschel, Davy, Faraday, Kelvin, Clerk-Maxwell, the observations as to combining weight, pressure and density of gases, structural crystallography and right and left handedness in atomic combination, bacteriology—all these things, with the innumerable other observations and hypotheses of science, both theoretically of interest and practically of use to mankind, have enormously increased the horizons. They have done that much at least, if they have not been able to alter our power of vision, so that throughout the extended plain of our knowledge we still read the old philosophical problems in the same old way.

On the lines of applied science, too, the advance has been increasingly rapid. In chemistry, both inorganic and organic, in electricity and mechanics, in the prophylactics and antiseptics of medicine and surgery, in the increased knowledge of anatomy and the use of anæsthetics—to record again only a few points—the greater comfort, ease and health of the individual and of the race has been studied. Hardly is a new discovery made but it is the next day on the market in one practical form or another. The first grain of radium was scarcely separated out in the laboratory of the Curies when it was to be found in the hospitals. Indeed, so great is the respect for science in its utilitarian—and financial—points of view that, were it not for the genuine devotion of men of science, it would almost seem to be in danger of ceasing to be science at all and becoming a purely huckstering and mercantile affair.

In any case, its having become vulgarized in at least one of its aspects, and its terms having slipped quietly and persistently into more or less general use, have insensibly had the effect of shifting, if not actually changing, the outlook. People, as a rule, are in too much of a hurry to ask what the true inner meaning of the phenomenon is when they are anxious only to apply it as soon as possible to some practical purpose.

And yet it might occur to the most ardent of modern exact scientists (using the term in its broad contradistinction to "philosophers") to enquire as to whether he ever breaks loose from the bonds of the actual phenomena with which he has to deal; whether the very forms of thought in which he habitually thinks and the terms with which he enriches the vocabulary are not actually forging fresh bonds of the purely phenomenal in which he becomes more and more shackled in any search for the noumenal and the real. It is a simple question to ask, even if it is not one that is asked often;

and it admits of a simple answer. There is one test, easy of application, that will show whether science enfranchises itself and gets beyond the boundaries of phenomenal observation. A child may describe something that he has seen—a small island, for instance—fairly accurately. He may draw a picture of it from the observations that he has made as to its position, contour and elevation, noting its principal bays and promontories, its greater hills and valleys. The surveyor or geographer would go further. With the aid of his theodolite and chain he would measure and calculate accurately. His trained observation is more careful and more detailed than that of the child; and his map of the island will be more complete, truer to scale, in every way more correct. Just so the man of science pushes his accurate observations as far as they will go. He adjusts the nicest of instruments to aid his senses. But take two, out of the many, of his doctrines to examine. In the seventeenth century Harvey discovered the systematic circulation of the blood. Now the systematic circulation of the blood is itself a phenomenon. It may be traced, as to a cause, to the muscular expansions and contractions of a living heart, sending the blood pulsing through the arteries in a systematic circulation. But that also is phenomenal. The working of the muscular tissue may be referred to the stimulation of involuntary nerves and nerve centres; but all this is phenomenal also, and the true explanation ever eludes and escapes behind it. A certain section of modern science is intolerant of any "vital principle;" and, to a certain extent, rightly so, since the vital principle is not in itself a phenomenon that can fall under any observation that science is capable of making. Consequently, so far as the observational method applies in Harvey's discovery, no advance whatever is made in the explanation or understanding of the realities; and this obviously, since the methods of experimental science and of essential philosophy are incommensurate.

To throw further light upon this distinction, one might do well to consider the latest theory, or hypothesis, of ions. Sir William Ramsay tells us that "it is always advisable to form a mental picture, if possible, of any physical phenomenon, *pour préciser les idées,* as the French say." He goes on to form for his readers such a mental picture of the motion of anions and kations. Now a mental picture is an imagination; and we are incapable of imagining anything whatever that has not, in some guise or another, come to us through the channels of sense and remains in our memory as a sense-impression. But whatever comes to us direct through sensation is phenomenal. Indeed, Ramsay quite concedes the phenomenal nature of ions in the sentence quoted. So that, here again, no advance

is made towards ultimate reality or its explanation. But it is quite clear that anything that is capable of taking up an electrical charge and of moving locally from anode to kathode, or *vice versa,* is a particle of matter, and that to explain it is quite as difficult, or quite as easy, a task as to set out at the beginning to explain matter before its structural delineation is presented in "mental pictures" to our minds.

Notwithstanding this very obvious distinction, drawn by such undoubted men of science as Sir William Ramsay, there is a very general feeling that science really *has* penetrated to the arcana of nature. And the glibness with which scientific terms and formulæ fall from the lips of the multitude would apparently force a reconstruction of views even in the sphere of religion.

What were, before this cheap popularization of science and of scientific terminology, questions confined to purely theological limits —the conflicting of theological systems, which all, however illogical some might be as a matter of fact, had a basis in common upon which to argue upon common topics; what in other centuries was a duel between revealed religion on the one hand and pure speculation upon the other, as exemplified in the Deists and Theists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has latterly become narrowed down, in the popular estimate at any rate, to a newer and a more pertinent issue. There is not now so much need to sharpen the weapons of logic or to furbish up the defensive armor of Holy Writ against those who, while calling themselves Christians, have lost touch with the centre of Christian unity. There is little advantage, even, in taking the field against professedly philosophical systems apparently inimical to the sure data of divine revelation. The conflict to-day, if indeed conflict there can be said to be at all, is supposed to lie between the results of modern science and religious truth. I use the safeguarding words with purpose; for there is in reality no conlict between science and faith; as a matter of fact, science and revelation are incommensurable. Still, certain interpreters and popularizers of science have so far made it their business to evolve theories that apparently militate against the explanations and general bearings of dogma that there seems to be and is, in common opinion at any rate, a very real discrepancy between the findings of the exact sciences, as they are called, on the one hand, and the truths of divine revelation on the other.

For many people the strong *a priori* presumption that the one divine Author of revealed and of rationally discovered truth cannot contradict the one in any part of the other becomes a weapon that is drawn, in the name of a sturdy and certain faith, to check the more daring sallies of a wildly speculative scientific spirit. Such men are

accustomed to point to the Church and to advance no other reason for any one particular point of dogma than that the Church teaches it. And this they do wisely, for they know that lacunæ lie behind the assumptions of all science; and while they may realize that similar lacunæ may lie between the natural interpretation of the world and the supernatural verities, they have the scaffolding of personal religious experience and the inviolable pillar of faith to connect them in such fashion that there can be no room for doubt as to the reality, truth and continuity of the two.

For others the experience of observation seems to furnish so good a ground for the "scientific" beliefs that are raised upon it; that it is practically impossible for them not to stigmatize the claims put forward in favor of any supernatural revelation as altogether childish, effete and untrue.

Between these two extreme positions, the one filled by such men of faith as have little interest in or desire for scientific study pure and simple, the other holding few besides materialists of whose principles the most notorious exponent at present is, perhaps, the somewhat discredited and much overrated professor of Jena, there are many half-compromises.

The true theologian of the twentieth century, imbued with some such spirit as St. Thomas Aquinas poured out upon the schools of his day, invokes the presumption of identical authorship of both kinds of knowledge, revealed and natural, not to suppress or degrade either, but to harmonize and explain them both.

A fact that is often lost sight of, and indeed that seems again and again to have been wittingly distorted and misrepresented, may well be alluded to in this connection. St. Thomas, as the best representative of the truest and highest phase of the philosophy of the mediæval schools, was quite accustomed to treat the problems upon which he wrote and taught by a method that would do credit to any modern man of science. We often hear of the baseless speculation, the trivial hair-splitting, the *a priori* argumentation of the scholastics. We are all familiar with the samples of reasoning that these misguided spinners and weavers of logical webs employed: "How many angels can stand on the point of a needle?" "Is it possible for God to substitute Himself for the devil, for an ass, for a gourd, for a flint? If so, in what way would the gourd preach, work miracles or be fixed to the cross?" These and similar samples are given to the world as a fair specimen of the scholastic doctrine and discipline.[2] Any one, however, who has made any pretence of reading such works as those that bear the name of St. Thomas, is

[2] And in the Prefatory Note of such a volume as Pront's translation of the "Cur Deus Homo?" in the Christian Classics Series.

aware of the utter ignorance and crass stupidity that makes such a presentation of scholasticism possible. When we are told, for example, in a note appended to the twenty-first chapter of the second book of St. Anselm's work that "this was one of the speculations of the Schoolmen. It is assumed that angels are distinct and isolated creations of God. They are of the same nature, but not of one race," we can only wonder hopelessly as to where the writer of that note obtained his knowledge of the Schoolmen and their teaching. The youngest students upon the benches of the theological class room could have put him right. Nothing of the kind is *assumed.* The doctrine, to which the writer of the note refers so cavalierly as "one of the speculations of the Schoolmen," flows logically and necessarily from the conception of the angel as a created being composed, not of matter and form, but of essence and existence. He may well be excused his ignorance in so difficult and so abstruse a question; but the same excuse cannot by any stretch of charity be extended to those whose knowledge of the scholastic work is so limited that they are able to stigmatize it as unscientific, puerile and absurd.

In the monumental work which he has bequeathed to posterity, the "Summa Theologiæ," St. Thomas reasons wherever it is possible from actual experience and observation. He at least cannot be blamed if his experimental data were meagre. They were as good for his purpose, to all practical intent, as the most modern of modern investigations, and from them he reasoned in the light of the great metaphysical principles to conclusions that will weather all the stress and strain of time. Until the mind of man changes, and that is to say, until man ceases to be man, the "Summa Theologiæ" will prove to be the norm of theological thought. Its principles are *the* perennial guiding principles of reason. It enshrines the truest philosophy and it embodies the most perfect scientific method.

In such a spirit, as I have said, the true theologian approaches his task of reconciliation. In such a spirit, too, the true man of science—and by far the majority of eminent scientific men have, as a fact, been, and are, men of this stamp—envisages the multifarious problems set him by nature. Not, indeed, that it lies in his province to concord his discoveries and the inferences correctly or incorrectly drawn from them with the teaching of the Church—for to science has not been accorded the guardianship of all truth—but rather because, interested as he naturally may be in revelation, he at least has no previous bias in favor of one apparent scientific truth rather than another, and, having none, he leaves revelation, which is not his subject, untouched in order that he may work out to their conclusions the actual problems which he finds before him.

It will be found as an almost invariable rule that the great men of science have not themselves been responsible for the difficulties of reconciliation that prompt, in the first instance, the desire of a dogmatic restatement. Some, no doubt, may be found who have added philosophizing to investigation and speculative to the exacter and more mathematical treatment of their subject. But, for the most part, the popularizers of scientific results, the small philosophers of new discoveries, are to blame for the apparent contradictions and difficulties that so make themselves felt. For in no case can any result of an exact science transcend the matter and material measurements with which all science deals. To be exact science must be experimental and observational; it must be formulated mathematically. And if the formulæ of one department of science be found, as in several instances they have been found, to hold good in others, they are none the less formulæ expressing the relations of mass, measurement or distance and time. Even in the science of chemistry, in which time is neglected and space only beginning to enter into the calculations, the proportional masses of bodies fixes the fundamental concept.

Consequently it is fairly obvious that it does not belong to exact science, so long as it remains exact, to probe the real questions which are so familiar in theology. And if, leaving the spatial, temporal and material conditions which are its guarantee of experimental accuracy, science attempts to formulate for itself a system of realities, it has then and there ceased to be science and is philosophy, and, moreover, it has no cogent scientific proof whatever to offer for the validity of its new speculations. Such speculations, at any rate, could never rightly lay claim to a scientific continuity, though, in a sense, they might point to an obscurely scientific origin.

This is a point which is often forgotten or lost sight of. It is so easy, so alluring, so entirely human, to speculate; so extraordinarily difficult to practice the abnegation of methodical exactness. The line separating science from philosophy is so thoughtlessly crossed and recrossed, that it is always with greatest veneration and respect that we ought to look upon those geniuses of science who resolutely refused to leave the noble lowliness of pure investigation for the alluring, but oftentimes perilous, heights of an imagination unfettered by the yoke that sober fact imposes.

On the other hand, such a well bestowed veneration should put us upon our guard against those who, while professing to tread steadily in the paths of science, in reality beguile us with a pseudo-scientific philosophy.

For to these latter knowledge is not so much growing in detailed extent as changing in nature. Old established principles of thought

are breaking down that new forms may take their place. Venerable arguments are being set aside as not fitted to the requirements of the modern mind. It may be that a merely relative value is given to the new forms of thought; but, if it is so, in the same breath all absolute values are swept away; and the principles by which human reason is governed—and we must concede human reason as it actually is, not as it might or ought to be—by being catalogued as relative, are rendered absolutely worthless.

But if they be wrong, these scientist-philosophers, leaving their miscroscopes and their balances, their test tubes and their calculus, and filling up the gaps in their data by creations of their own fertile minds, logically enough evolved there, no doubt, if the principles they seek to establish be granted beforehand; if they turn from their measures and retorts to a theoretical construction of matter, which *may* represent fact as it does spatially picture it, but which undoubtedly leaves the only real point of the problem to be solved without even the ghost of a solution; if they be wrong in this, then the theologians have no need to adapt their teaching to new principles or theories, but only to explain and unfold the old dogmatic truths upon the old lines in the light of modern exact research, discovery and statement.

As an example of the explanation rather than adaptation which is urged, the treatment due to-day to almost any theological term would suffice. Consider, for example, the word *person* and its meaning. Has exact science in any sense caused the conception expressed by this word to shift? It is not here a question of the etymological changes accompanying and denoting the growth of language. When we employ the word, even in this twentieth century, we know perfectly well that we do not mean a masked actor; and if any doubt exists as to what is the precise signification—the full extent and content—of the word, the old philosophical definition, fitting the root thought congenial to our minds, will easily banish it.

Has, then, modern science discovered in its researches that we, who are persons, are anything else than "individual substances of a rational nature?"

Doubtless we should be assailed with a storm of criticism for such an exact definition. Atomistic philosophers and upholders of the broader theory of evolution would come to the attack armed with hypothesis and theory. We should be told that there is no such thing as substance in the sense in which we employ the term; that an individual is the aggregate result of as many individuals as there are atoms in his composition; that the rational nature is the outcome of the irrational, and that, were our record of nature perfect we should find included in it an infinity of variations and degrees of rationality.

But it is certainly worthy of notice that not one such criticism—if we except, perhaps, the second—comes from a scientist speaking formally as a man of science. They are the cavils of scientists, if you will, but of scientists speaking as philosophers, indulging in speculations, imagining realities and freed from all the tests of scientific exactness. And with these Catholic theologians are familiar, with the familiarity of long acquaintance gained by several thousand years of recrudescent heresy.

Is it necessary, then, to accommodate dogmatic teaching to the newer phraseology of pseudo-scientific philsophy? Would there be any real gain in translating our terms, supposing that such a proceeding were feasible, into their equivalents in these self-confessed relative schools? If we wished to present the truths of dogma in an easier form to the world there would undoubtedly be such a gain, in the one supposition that these schools of philosophy had caught the public ear and at the same time were radically true or, at least, not radically false and incapable of correction. But since it is impossible to suppose that the scholastic doctrine, say, of matter and form, is in any real sense translatable into the chemico-philosophical theory of physical atoms, *plus* their shape and position in space and *minus* a substantial reality determining the resultant, before attempting to make so radical a change in a terminology that has crystallized around the root theological ideas and been consecrated by an immemorial service, it would be pertinent first of all to examine as to which of the two theories claims with the better right our allegiance.

It might be easy—to continue the use of the term *person* as our example—to suppose that we were, as a matter of fact, no more than aggregates of uniformly similar atoms in a perpetual state of violent vibration, kept in order and thus relatively in place by some such principle as the soul. And this would doubtless hold good, when adjusted, for all material beings. They would—we would—be as it were porous; and omitting any mention of the undoubted difficulty of one formal principle extending itself to separated individual atoms, the aggregate of particles, existing as such because of the soul, would take the place of what scholastics know as *materia prima.*

But the modern philosophical atomists would have us consider the constituent atoms as already of themselves matter of a definite kind, necessitating our labelling them substances. In this event we should be as far from a reconciliation as ever; for we should be obliged to look upon the human person as an accidental, rather than as a substantial, unity.

It is quite obvious that whichever view of these two is to be trans-

lated into the terminology of the other must undergo an extraordinarily labored accommodation. No matter to what extent the molecular particles be theoretically attenuated, they can never cease to be of a definite material nature, possessing definite material qualities and constituting in their aggregation a definite mass. From the various activities of the resultant being certain structural, physical, chemical, biological and internal alterations can be inferred; and, it is conceivable, could be written down in the symbolism of atomic formulæ with an almost surprising degree of mathematical exactness. It is likewise obvious that this view leaves altogether out of account the question of the possibility of spiritual natures, since it is unable to include them under its own specific terminology.

More than this; it is unable to explain or to refer to any of its own formulæ the immaterial functions which are manifested and acknowledged in the case of man. The crudities of those who would refer to thought as a secretive product of organic tissues will never be taken seriously by the thoughtful, much though it might be desirable to include many, and indeed all, processes, physical and psychical alike, in a single algebraic concept.

The mind is confronted here with a consideration which does not have reference to degrees of organicity but to real diversity of principle; and, although we may well adopt everything that exact science has had to tell us in the past and be prepared to listen with respect to all that it may teach us in the future, we should do well to pause before admitting too readily the extraordinarily far-reaching conclusions that are not seldom built upon its exact, though meagre, data. It is well to remember that Cavendish, who first separated the constituents of water; Liebig, whose laboratory at Giessen was perhaps the most fertile of all in results, and Michael Faraday did not admit any possible existence of physical atoms. For the same reason, Sir Humphry Davy used the word "proportion," and Dr. Wollaston "equivalent," in place of that which has now come into general use. Sir William Ramsay warns us that "we must beware of confusing this (the atomic) theory with the facts on which it is founded." Indeed, though in the preparation of mere text-books of chemistry or physics we should hardly be led to expect any very deep philosophical considerations set before the student, there are books in which some reference is made to the fact that the theory is, after all, a chemical or a physical one in the strict sense of the words, and not in any way an attempt to account for the ultimate constitution of matter; and, if this is not the case with all text-books, it should not be forgotten that such works are written for the sole purpose of teaching the sciences of chemistry, or heat, or electricity.

When in the hands of the scientist philosophizer, the laws of proportions, affinity, periodicity are exalted into an explanation of the essential nature of matter, the beauty of the whole fabric of the science of chemistry vanishes in an instant and shrinks into the distorted semblance of a philosophy like that of Democritus or Leucippus. The actual data will not support the theory when it goes from an imaginative structural account of matter to a description of its essential nature.

Comparatively long as this discursus into a particular aspect of transmuted science has been, it is far too brief to do anything like full justice to the better claims of the really philosophical theory that wisely distinguishes between the actually and the potentially existent. But it does bring out to some extent the force of the contention that the old explanation of the essence of material beings has had and has nothing to fear from the advance of exact scientific learning. It puts the fact in its true light—that philosophy must ever strive with philosophy, that there is really no level meeting ground between an exact science and one that, transcending all the conditions upon which that exactness is based, professes to account for natures and essences.

The concept which we denote by the word *person* has in no sense been changed by the enlarging of the boundaries of science. That a revived philosophy should attempt to change it only puts the hands of the clock back some twenty-five hundred years in the history of reason. Is it, then, the case that those who urge a reconstruction of theological statement in the light of modern science really wish to have dogma explained and retranslated into the terms of new or revived philosophical systems?

While speaking of the theological term chosen as one example out of many, I have naturally spoken of it as denoting a reasonable rather than a revealed concept. We must have the stable and common elements of thought that are conveyed by the elements of language before any revelation can, by combining them, make any real impression whatever upon our understanding; unless a revelation is so purely unique and personal as to be incommunicable.

And even where revelation has deepened and broadened our native ideas by unfolding the possibilities of the radical concept, as it has in the case of the word we have been considering and its true signification, it has had those natural and necessary ideas as its primitive data, else it could not have conveyed supernatural truth to us at all, save, as I have said, as a unique, intuitive, incommunicable vision.

Hence, though for the purposes of an exact theological system as much of the full content and extent of every concept and cor-

responding term as is possible should be gained, to teach consistently and accurately the truth of Christ, the exact natural meaning of words and the exact natural value of concepts is all that is required. And with no less than this is such teaching possible.

In this, rather than in any accommodation or adaptation of theology to either science or systems of philosophy, a clear statement and a simple explanation of the perennial and unchanging natures of things and of thoughts is to be desired.

To take refuge in the exaltation of mysticism would appear to be as fatal as to yield without a struggle to false philosophies; for the supernatural does not conflict with natural truth. To give credence to every wayward theory that is proposed with any faint shadow of a truthful consistence with observed facts is one of the worst traits, and a vicious trait, of the modern mind; a trait neither scientific nor philosophical. And if the taunt that a virile science has at length been found to combat the pretensions of an antiquated philosophy or theology irks or shames in any way, those of us who hold that even humanly gained truth is inviolable and unchangeable may comfort ourselves with the reflection that as in the infancy of philosophic thought lips babbled their crude explanations of reality, so now, in the extreme decrepitude and decay of the philosophic temper, they again babble in the halting syllables of their childhood.

What, then, is the true attitude that churchmen should take up with regard to science? Ought they to neglect it altogether in all religious questions as offering neither possible support nor possible criticism? Ought our theology to be closed up in some secret part of our mind as having nothing whatever in common with our other knowledge—in something the same way that the religion of some people is shut up by itself, away from and out of touch with the other influences and interests of their lives? Surely not. While remembering that the brilliant forward march of exact science has done nothing of itself to invalidate the claims of revelation or the truth of its teaching, we should surely not throw it over as of no possible use to theology. But whereas upon its findings conclusions have been raised that are in the highest degree untrustworthy and dangerous, upon those same findings, correctly understood, ought to be arranged and consolidated the eternal and natural verities that are at the same time the bulwark and interpretation of God-given truth.

Few men can acquire even a moderately comprehensive view of their own subject from outside—seen, as it were, in its place in the totality of knowledge. Fewer still seem to attempt to adjust the growing mass of exact observations to the changeless forms in which

we all must of necessity think. It would be a real service to science to relate it to the great comprehensive principles of sane philosophy.

It is necessary that theology should be taught in plain terms. But the plainest terms are, after all, those that are in themselves the truest; and they are not to be found in any pseudo-scientific philosophy.

F. Aveling.

London, England.

THE FRENCH ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION.

II.

IT WILL be useful to record here a translation of an Inquisition decree dated March 6, 1907:

"The Supreme Congregation has already with the greatest care decreed major excommunication against Joseph-Rene Vilatte. It is related that having several times unsuccessfully tried to obtain priestly or episcopal dignities which he ardently desired, he at last found two heretic and schismatic men alleging themselves to be Bishops, although not known by the Church. One of them conferred the priestly, the other the episcopal, dignity on him. Vilatte visited Rome to ask pardon and absolution, which were not granted because it was perceived he was not sincere. Subsequently he went so far as to presume by a sacrilegious ceremonial to consecrate as Bishop the rebellious priest, Paul Miraglia.

"In consequence of these acts the major excommunication was pronounced on June 13, 1900, against the pseudo-Bishop. Vilatte being now established in Paris and unblushingly provoking a schism by profaning Catholic worship, the Congregation of the Inquisition deems well to renew the sentence of excommunication already pronounced against the said Vilatte.

"Accordingly, let the faithful, especially priests, take care not to participate in or favor his sacrilegious actions, lest they, too, fall into the same situation he unfortunately occupies; let such persons as, deceived by him, are in any manner communicating with him, return immediately to wiser thoughts in order to escape ecclesiastical penalties and to avoid utter ruin!"

This charlatan had to leave the former Barnabite Chapel after eight weeks' tenure, from Sexagesima to Easter Day, inclusive, and to notify no function elsewhere for Low Sunday, at the instance of the liquidator who is selling those premises. Lecturing there on the Mass, he declared it would be more logical and conformable to

modern notions of what is fitting to say it in French. He was, when he quitted Rue Legendre, unprovided with a theatre of operations.

Nothing more had been heard of the mountebank up to Pentecost; but the premises in the Rue Legendre were acquired at the public auction (with consent of the Barnabite Fathers, as required by canon law) for $145,000 by the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, who has transformed the chapel into the parish church of a new parish of 25,000 souls, taken from the territories of four existing parishes. While this restoration was in progress the President of the republic was not ashamed by decree to "disaffect" from religious uses the large and handsome Church of St. Peter's, in Lyons, because, on Sunday, May 5, festival of St. Philip, a Solemn High Mass was celebrated therein by the French Royalists, a political group this year fast receiving many accessions from unexpected quarters, which is nowise surprising, seeing what has been undone by the republic, while all it has done of importance is to more than double the debt and taxation.[1]

M. Etienne Flandin intends proposing to the Chambers a project of proportional and equitable representation that, if adopted, would probably go far towards introducing justice into the actual system and making Parliament a fairly faithful image of the country, but adoption by the present majority is an inconceivable hypothesis.

In the January number, on page 175, it is stated that Cardinal Richard had authorized declarations by his clergy after the proposed leases for eighteen years should be actually signed. His Eminence lost no time in submitting to the Protestant prefect of the Seine, M. de Selves, a draft lease of the Paris Cathedral (Notre Dame) and the historical St. Denis Basilica. It was understood that, if settled and signed, this contract should serve as the model to be followed in the remaining eighty-five French dioceses. The Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican authorized these negotiations, against his personal judgment, without any illusions as to the result, simply to satisfy the French episcopate[2] and a minority in the Sacred College.

---

[1] A notable schismatic centre has been established at Lyons, in the parish of Saint Georges, by its parish priest, the Abbé Soulier, who has had for years disputes with his superiors, to whom he never submitted. On November 4, 1902, the Cardinal Archbishop interdicted him from celebrating Mass or any ecclesiastical function, as well as from preaching and administering sacraments, in the parish—an ordinance confiremd on appeal by the Conciliar Congregation on July 18, 1903. Late last year a worship association was formed, and to it M. Soulier transferred, on December 10, 1906, the church properties. Cardinal Coullié towards the end of February deprived him, and declared the benefice vacant.

[2] At their third meeting, related on page 173, two-thirds took the same view as His Eminence; one-third were too sanguine about their project.

M. Briand, not less determined than M. Combes to strangle the French Church, though he puts on, when it seems expedient, velvet gloves before acting, pursued, as the Holy Father had foreseen, the usual tactics. Accordingly, after negotiations extending over three weeks, the Prefect informed the Cardinal (in writing, on February 23) that His Eminence's proposals were inacceptable, but the government invited amended ones based on ministerial declarations made in the Chamber during a stormy debate on February 19, when M. Briand found himself forced to confess the churches were left open in view of the truth that a parliamentary majority had "no right to hinder millions of Catholic compatriots from practicing their religion." The Cardinal Archbishop replied immediately that the text of the draft submitted embodied the extreme limits of possible concessions. His Eminence told his *entourage* that further negotiations, it was to be feared, "would be useless, would produce no result and would entail preoccupations alien to the true object of archiepiscopal duty, namely, instruction of souls. We have sufficiently manifested our good will, let us now have recourse to Divine grace. The Church is not a diplomatic institution. Her business is the edification of souls. Duty before everything. We shall avail of the open churches so long as government do not oppose our usage thereof. If they should do so, we will preach Jesus Christ's Gospel elsewhere. It is time to resume evangelical work freed from discussions only profitable to politicians."[3]

[3] The archiepiscopal *Semaine Religieuse*, of Paris, March 2, says in regard to the referendum to Mayors ordered by the episcopate: "It was, in our view, essential for an impartial appreciation of the men and things of our time to learn not only the intentions of the central power, *i. e.*, the Cabinet, in respect of the Church, but also those of local and provincial powers, *i. e.*, of the forty thousand Mayors and municipal councils, who are in direct contact with the clergy and the population. For the first time, then, not merely some hundreds of 'representatives,' more or less faithful interpreters of popular will, but the people themselves have had to face a question concisely, clearly put: Do you purpose preserving your churches and seeing that worship is freely exercised there by ministers who shall be free from any material or moral restriction on the part of the State? And the reply is, categorically, yes, despite hostile pressure of all kinds. This national consultation, incomplete as it was, has therefore had a grand result, and, better still, a consoling result."

In Lyons Archdiocese there are seven hundred communes, but only ten Mayors refused to contract, and half of the total number replied unconditionally they were ready to sign. Picardy is notoriously the most religiously indifferent province in France, possibly owing to its vicinity to England and to several considerable English Protestant colonies; but in the North generally the great majority of Mayors were desirous to contract. There are exceptional cases elsewhere. At Neffies, in Montpelier Diocese, the council refused "because the parish priest does not suit us," and the church is closed. At Beyssac (in Correze) the Mayor replied to the invitation by closing the church, and Mass is said in a barn a mile away.

At Cressia, in the Jura, the Mayor refused use of the sequestrated presby-

Earlier in the month the Bishop of Agen announced: "Failing to arrange contracts, we shall remain as simple occupants in our churches until expulsed." A common-sense policy now universally adopted.

Every one at last feels time has been lost, ground surrendered through counsels of dilatoriness and a spirit of compromise prevailing, instead of prompt enthusiastic response to the first trumpet-call last year from Rome, "Arm for fighting!" Pearls of patience and meekness ought not to be thrown away upon "swine, lest, perhaps, they trample them under feet and, turning, tear" would-be propitiators, however well-intentioned. Less sentimental, more muscular Christianity are wants of France. The holy war consistently preached from the Vatican is practiced successfully as well as skillfully by Cardinal Merry del Val himself. That fighting Prince of the Church has made the most of the unprecedented outrage against international law and usage which the Clemenceau Cabinet perpetrated last December by seizing Papal archives and premises when expulsing without any notice from the country the guardian, Monsignor Montagnini; nor will this matter be dropped by the Catholic powers whom His Eminence induced to intervene on behalf of the Holy See.

On the other hand, the army has ignored the warlike Papal injunction addressed to all French Catholics. Obeying instead the Freemason word of command, generals, colonels, officers, privates have everywhere been fighting seminarists, women, children or defenders of shrines.[4] Military eloquence has been reserved for gasconade

---

tery to the parish priest, in spite of the petition of 135 out of the 180 heads of families in his commune, claiming to retain the priest, whom the Bishop of St. Claude took away, as the Bishops generally have done when no place to live in could be had from hostile Mayors either refusing one absolutely or asking exaggerated rentals for the accustomed homes now seized. Canon Gadeune, priest of Ranches (Nord) for sixty years, resided in a presbytery Gadenne, priest of Ranches (Nord) for sixty years, resided in a presbytery built by himself, the taxes of which he has always paid. In the one hundred and first year of his age he is "invited" to quit it or pay the municipality $50 yearly rental for it! However, as in the case of the referendum, the great majority of communes have granted use of presbyteries at low or nominal rentals, or even free. At Montsanche (Nievre) the municipality, considering the "incoherent state of the laws, and that no people can subsist without its religion," unanimously granted use "in perpetuity" to their "priest, Dean Gaudry, and all his successors." In Nancy Diocese two hundred municipalities (one-third of the total number) granted their presbyteries free, but the Prefect arbitrarily quashed all these grants, although M. Briand declared in the Chamber on February 19 Prefects are not in law entitled to annul mayoral contracts. The Mayor of Boissy de Cutte (S. et O.) offered the priest his presbytery for a franc per day, payable weekly in advance to the village policeman.

[4] In the two Departments of Nord and Pas de Calais alone the doors, etc., of one hundred churches or sacristies were burst or blown open in November to take inventories, those operations being protected by mobilization of 10,000 troops. The expense amounted to $40,000, which taxpayers had to pay.

in the casernes about an impracticable *revanche,* and illusory conquests of territory where Catholics, being free and favored, are to-day contented under an unsought for rule providentially given them a generation ago. When Napoleon III. had followed his army into that same territory on his road "to Berlin," General Trochu, in Paris, assured the Empress Eugenie, hand on his heart, that his "last drop of blood," whenever occasion arose, would be shed in her defense. Very soon the Empress appealed to this chivalrous champion for protection against the furious mob outside the Tuileries. The general excused himself; it would not do for him, in his position, to stir a finger. The lonely sovereign had to seek in the street herself a fiacre, and drive to the American dentist, Dr. Evans, at the hospitable mansion in the (then) Avenue de l'Imperatrice.[5]

The one bright feature in the general situation is that the declaration repeal bill has, after incomprehensible delays, become law, being finally voted by the Chamber on March 27 in the form adopted by the Senate. Its text will be found on page 171 (striking out the three words, "at any hour," which the Senators sagaciously refused absolutely to accept). This bill, No. 4, and its predecessor, No. 3 (the law of January 2, 1907), now enable the French clergy to freely use the open churches as hitherto (until mid-December next), notwithstanding the separation law of 1905, which forbids their doing this, and notwithstanding the ministerial declaration at the opening of the paraliamentary session on November 5, 1906, whereby M. Clemenceau engaged: "We shall apply the separation law without weakness, in the whole of its dispositions; and should it appear to us that the penalties established are insufficient (*i. e.,* to compel compliance with all its requirements) we shall not hesitate to propose additional ones." Very tall talk; and a long climb down within five months! Thanks to the brute forces of soldiers, police, officers, guns and dynamite, the persecutors have secured, so far, sacrilegious possession of ecclesiastical properties now valued by M. Briand as

[5] While dressing for a small dinner party he intended giving (Mrs. Evans being at the seaside), the doctor was informed a lady in mourning urgently wished to see him. "Have I not often said I can only see ladies at the consultation rooms?" "Yes, sir; but this lady's air is such that I dared not refuse to announce her." "Well, let her write on this scrap what her business is." The lady scribbled something, folded the paper, and the valet took it up-stairs. Not long afterwards, Mrs. Evans' wardrobe having been hurriedly requisitioned for necessary articles, and the doctor's friend, Mr. Drexel, having replaced him as host at the table, Empress and dentist were driving in a closed carriage and pair to Pontoise railway station, where train was taken for Dieppe. There Sir John Burgoyne's yacht, which fortunately happened to be in harbor, received the distinguished fugitive, who, in her dire extremity, had been thrown over by "the General with a plan." Generals of to-day have followed the lead.

productive of a hundred million dollars yearly. They have, it is true, also seized, thanks to those material forces at their beck and call, nearly fifty thousand edifices, but are now discovering these are mostly white elephants.

Catholics "without juridical title," pronounced to be "simple occupants" *pro tem.*, and at the pleasure of anti-Christian Ministers and bloc, are certainly unlikely to put their hands in their pockets or draw largs checks to defray repairs of those edifices. The up-keep of the Cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris alone costs from $12,000 to $16,000 yearly. It is estimated repairs of all the national churches cost ten million dollars yearly. The clergy have now no funds for such expenses. The budget of worships being suppressed, they have been deprived furthermore of some seven or eight million dollars yearly for most meagre and modest stipends, and now look only to the faithful for wherewith to live. Neither will Providence fail His servants.[6]

All the surrenders grudgingly made by the Ministry are attributable (under the same unfailing providence of what is necessary) to the fighting policy urged from Rome and pursued by the parliamentary minority and by the faithful in provinces where (unlike lax Picardy) religion is esteemed.

Monsignor Pechenard, the distinguished and scholarly rector of the Catholic Institute in Paris for several years, now Bishop ot Soissons, shortly after his consecration, in a letter to the chapter last January, affirmed "the devastation of the Christian vineyard was—*fera singularis devastavit eam*—the work of a ferocious beast, unique of its kind, predicted in the Apocalypse, and whose mark will shortly have to be in the hand of every buyer or seller." The contest between that repulsive Masonic goat and the Bride of the Lamb must be fought to a finish, in Parliament, the chancelleries, the law courts, the press, the streets—if anti-Christ is not to trample order, the family, civilization, as well as religion, under insupportable unclean hoofs.

Between such natural enemies, for whom there can be no *via media,* three noteworthy struggles in progress, diplomatically or legally, appeal to foreign Catholic hearts, viz., sequestrations of the Irish College in Paris, the Montmartre Church of the Sacred Heart, the Grotto and Sanctuaries of Lourdes.

[6] The Holy Father has not only refused any Peter's Pence from France, but is assisting the French clergy. The education budget voted in December last amounted to $42,000,000, or about six times as much as the suppressed budget for religion. This secular instruction, unillumined by any "heavenly lights," is that given exclusively now by what M. Guiry, academy inspector, in February told a congress of teachers is "the Godless school, a title flung at us, but which we claim as a title of honor, a title expressing the reason for our establishment and a part of our programme."

That the Masonically engineered *entente cordiale,* a rather frail and sickly exotic, might not suffer chill, Lord Lansdowne left in the lurch the English Benedictine Congregation, who naively dreamed of the British Lion procuring justice for their Douay College and properties, if not immunity from dispersion under the associations law of 1901. But just now the Irish race and votes are highly esteemed in Downing street, so it is highly probable that MM. Clemenceau, Briand and the bloc will, before autumn, be taught through the British Foreign Office and the Paris Embassy some needful lessons in settling knotty questions arising out of their proposed confiscation of the college in Rue des Irlandais, Paris.

In the Rue des Carmes (No. 14) is still to be seen the chapel of the Lombard College, built for Irish ecclesiastical students forced to quit Ireland by the various persecutions of the Royal Tudor Bluebeard, his illegitimate daughter and the regicide Cromwell. The French monarch, by letters patent in 1672, authorized its constitution as a corporate body, and a century later Dr. Lawrence Kelly, its rector, by royal permission, acquired for a larger seminary the considerable additional freehold property in the Rue des Irlandais, from the first destined and used for seminarists, the Lombard College (now leased to a Catholic workmen's club) being reserved for priests. When the sequestration period arrived there were seventy Irish seminarists in this Irish College, under the charge of Irish Vincentian Fathers, directed by the Irish episcopate and perfectly independent of the French Church, State or public, being maintained by Irish foundations. During three centuries the successive French Governments have recognized and protected the important establishment. The existing government want to sell what they have claimed so unjustifiably to seize, viz., the valuable freehold and invested "foundations," converting the proceeds into three per cent. rente, and creating bourses (scholarships) therewith for English, Scotch and Irish seminarists (nominated by the British Embassy) who will follow their theological course in France, where the few Catholic institutions still available to such students are threatened with final suppression sooner or later. The difficulties under which seminaries suppressed and reconstituted labor are explained further on in this paper.

Unnecessary is it to enumerate the manifold absurdities of this fantastic scheme.[7] It is energetically opposed by the present Am-

[7] The thimble-rig game played by these confiscators, once the P. (for product) is in their hands, was, shortly before Easter, exposed in the civil tribunal at Lorient, where Madame Glotin, a widow, sued and obtained judgment against the official sequestrator of a considerable sum she had paid to the Church fabrique at Merville for Masses of requiem that have ceased to be said since the December seizures in that parish, although when

bassador of the Protestant State that is (originally) responsible for the formation of an Irish College on French soil! Sir Francis Bertie told Monsignor Montagnini, referring to it before the Papal guardian of archives was expulsed (last December): "I said to M. Pichou (the French Foreign Minister) Great Britain never allowed, never will allow, British subjects to be despoiled with impunity in any part of the globe." After the expulsion and the outrage against international law as well as against diplomatic manners, the envoy of another Protestant State (Holland), Chevalier Stuers, remarked: "This may astonish civilized folks, but what better can be expected from such duffers (*mufles*)?" The same outspoken diplomatist truly said to Mgr. Montagnini the French Catholics were "fighting not only for the Pope, but for Christianity."

On December 13, 1906, an order of the Protestant Prefect of the Seine nominated a sequestrator of the Sacred Heart Basilica at Montmartre, Paris, as forming part of the ecclesiastical properties of the archbishopric, and the official designated at once notified tenants of dependent buildings to pay their rentals on January 1 to him. The Church has long been coveted by the Grand Orient, but the will of the lodges has not, up to now, been decided and indicated to the obedient Cabinet. In December, 1870, two Parisians who had fled to Poitiers made a vow there to cause a national church dedicated to the Sacred Heart to be built, that the calamitous war, then at its worst stage, might cease. Several Bishops approved the project, the Pope assented, a subscription list was started and the work, constituted thus by private initiative, began in the early months of 1871, Paris being chosen as headquarters of the undertaking, which the Archbishop, Mgr. Guibert, approved in the January following. Four years later His Grace became its president, and on March 5, 1873, addressed a letter to the Minister of Worships, which was submitted during the parliamentary session to the Chambers with a project of law that was discussed during two days, voted on July 24 and promulgated as law July 31, 1873, as follows:

"Art. 1. The construction of a church on the hill of Montmartre conformably to the demand made by the Archbishop of Paris in his letter of March 5, 1873, to the Minister of Worships is decreed to be of public utility. This church, which shall be constructed exclu-

the money was paid taxation upon it was also paid to the proper official bureau in order to legalize the transaction; so that to levy that tax and then lay hands on the whole fund taxed is, in the words of Canon Mincll, of Rheims, simple robbery. The sequestrator's defense was merely the legal quibble that he was incompetent to plead in an action which could only in law be brought after all the property sequestrated should be handed over to benevolent uses. This, although the Government has declared no moneys destined for such pious uses should be handed over to any one for any purpose; all such are to be "reserved."

sively with funds provided by subscriptions, will, in perpetuity, be used for exercising public Catholic worship. Art. 2. The site shall be settled by the Archbishop of Paris in concert with the Prefect of the Seine. Art. 3. The Archbishop of Paris, for himself and his successors, shall substitute themselves for and take on themselves all administrative rights and obligations, and are hereby authorized to acquire the ground requisite for constructing the church, with its dependencies, either by private treaty or, if necessary, by expropriation."

Thus the work of the national vow to the Sacred Heart of Jesus was legally declared to be of public utility.

The land necessary was acquired solely by means of public and private subscriptions, gathered from probably every country in the world as well as from French citizens. On the faith of this law eight million dollars were collected and expended on the vast temple and the land, every subscriber reckoning on that perpetual use for Catholic worship of this church which the Republican Legislature in Article 1 had guaranteed. The work has always been kept independent of the archiepiscopal properties, among which the Prefecture seeks to include it. Appeal against the iniquitous sequestration was, after the Christmas holidays, made to the Council of State and other proceedings were also taken in the Tribunal of the Seine.

Many readers of this REVIEW have made the pilgrimage to Lourdes once or oftener. All must have at least read Henry Lasserre's delightful classic, "Our Lady of Lourdes," a book that has had a much greater circulation than any volume (excepting the Bible) published in any country last century, and that is printed in some eighty languages.

Universal satisfaction was experienced when it became known that on November 25, 1906, some three weeks before the operation of the separation law of 1905, a lease was signed before notaries between the Bishop of Tarbes and the Count Etienne de Beauchamp, Mayor of Morthemer, departmental councillor of Vienne, and president (these many years) of the corps of brancardiers, or litter-bearers who take the infirm and sick daily to and from the Grotto; the lessee to have uncontrolled possession of the Grotto and grounds for periods of three, six or nine years (customary periods in French leases), at his option, at an anual rental of $1,300. The basilica, crypt and Rosary Church, by Papal directions, are not included in the property leased, but, of course, access to them can only be had through grounds leased to the Count, who can exclude whom he pleases. Nevertheless, before Christmas a sequestrator was nominated and sequestration notice was served. The Count is wealthy and will contest his rights to the last.

French judgments about their compatriots, the causes of the lamentable situation and its probable future are more interesting than are the views of foreigners. Here, then, are some observations from lay native authorities on such questions: "The present persecution is a Divine chastisement. Blind indeed is the man who cannot see this. Sad to acknowledge, it is true to say that, like to some fallen great ancestral house, France lives only on her ancient reputation. In name the eldest daughter of the Church and a Christian nation, she is really scarcely one or the other. Where are the true Christians whose actions correspond to their faith? They are an *elite,* and every *elite* is a small body. The great mass of Christians set foot inside a church for baptism, First Communion, marriage, burials only. They are indifferent, forgetful, degenerate Catholics, without regard to either the law of Sunday observance or that of Easter duties. Business, amusements constitute in two words their ideal and represent their life. Practically they ignore God, Jesus Christ, the Church. Such, I am bound to say, is a great part of what we style 'Christian France'—a mere shadow of itself in the past. This being so, how could the Almighty, who chastises in order to enlighten and cure, refrain from permitting to sweep over the land this purifying wave of persecution? The illustrious St. Cyprian of Carthage in the third century hoped for a persecution to awaken his 'sleeping faithful,' many of whom were frequent or daily communicants; and would not that martyred Bishop, did he appear among us, far more earnestly desire a wind of persecution to rouse from mortal lethargy innumerable French Catholics all but dead, without faith or Christian life?" (M. de Bonneval.)

Compare these denunciations with the following eminently prudent, faithful and acute criticisms of the distinguished lay sociologue, the Catholic author of "Jewish France." He writes of his country:

"Every one tries to discover the cause of these evils in his own way. It is the incomprehensible baseness of our generals, says one, which has lost everything. Another says, it is our principal misfortune to have had no true parliamentary opposition. Others charge the education given to our youths by the congregations with failure to produce the results expected. Public opinion is strongly impressed by the contrast between the very real sufferings of our clergy and the luxurious, pleasant lives led by a section of our aristocracy. The real cause of our evils is, in my opinion, that our race is used up. Not only are beliefs weakened, but the characters and temperaments wherein they were sown are weakened. We are told in the Gospel parable of the seed lost among stones and weeds, how the Word of God is choked and stifled by the cares and pleasures of this life. During two decades the Jesuits have had the education

of the youth of the aristocracy and upper middle class; but instead of therefore being now masters in France, they are treated as pariahs, not as French citizens. Their colleges are shut, their communities dispersed. Profoundly unjust would it be to deny that many who were formed in those establishments are among our best and most devout; still, it is incontestable these instructors, incomparable in certain respects, have not produced a strong generation, prepared for every sacrifice, ready to dare and do everything to ensure the triumph of their ideas. If you broach these questions with the religious they will tell you all that is true, but they had not the right sort of stuff to work on. It is quite certain, at any rate, they never taught their pupils 'Don't trouble about the crimes, scandals and cowardly acts that dishonor your country; infamies committed against everything Christian, everything inspired by love for Christ, who died for you, are no concerns of yours. All you need think of is how to amuse yourself, how to get the best places in the fashionable theatre of the day to see the piece of the season.' The fact is, the religious did their best to turn out a courageous and resolute generation. Others did their best. Everything has failed."

The same experienced observer, contrasting his decadent contemporaries with their predecessors of the days of Montalembert, Gratry, Gaume, de Raviguan, Veuillot, Berryer, Lamoriciere, says: "I suppose traces of character, manliness, firmness are not to be expected in the magistrature now, nor in the parliamentary world, any more than in the army. Nothing is more instructive than the feebleness, the sterility of our so-called republican regime, which has nothing republican about it beyond the name. Base, contemptible oligarchy as it really is, directed by a syndicate of Jews and Freemasons. This regime has so demoralized, corrupted, perverted the country by numberless scandals, by the spectacle of robbery, conspiracy, deception, practically become inherent to our customs and institutions, that the notions of forty years ago are completely altered. The question of public or private morality has no longer importance or meaning. Formerly had an African compaigner been ordered to attack, in time of peace, seminary or convent, he would have angrily said his business was to defend his country, not to do such dirty work. Now, officers who have had better Christian training than that blunt African veteran, and who on occasions approach the sacraments, obey without a frown Masonic commands that are outrages on their faith. There is an atrocious irony about our times when everything done for the best has turned out for the worst; and to point this out from time to time is the only earthly consolation left to us unfortunate writers for persevering, indefatigable labors, for courageous and devoted efforts in the good cause."

A highly competent authority on Freemasonry, M. Paul Nourrisson, in a conference at Paris in February, complained: "How often among Catholics do we hear it said, 'Oh, the Freemasons won't do this; they don't dare,' and then every one goes quietly to bed. It is a woful mistake. Our enemies have an end in view and will go on until they reach it. They may pause now and again to give us time to calm down, but presently a fresh wave will come to sweep us under it. Let us not say Providence will save us. God does not owe any miracles to us. It is for us to labor at our salvation and our country's salvation. God once did for France what He never did for any other nation, but then it was to favor a Joan of Arc. Are we to-day worthy of like Providential help? We ought to take action upon every ground, the religious, the social, the commercial; bearing in mind the admirable reply Joan made to her judges' question why she did not negotiate with the enemy instead of giving him battle, 'Because,' said Joan of Arc, 'I knew I could only get peace at the point of the lance.' It is at the lance's point we, too, are bound to reconquer peace for ourselves, liberty and independence for our holy religion."

It is not exaggerating to say that if such counsellors as I have quoted had been listened to *and followed,* there would have been no "ecclesiastical" legislation since 1901. The opposition and the governmental party voters are within about a quarter of a million equal in their total numbers in the whole country; and it is said—no doubt with some truth—the scale is weighted on the wrong side by the 603,566 functionaries and employés of State, departments and communes.

If Providential interposition to do what is the duty of Catholics themselves need not be hoped for, yet unexpected judgments have already befallen the hapless nation, others are in store for it.

On December 11 last the guardian of Papal archives in Paris was arrested, then conducted to the Italian frontier, which he crossed next morning on his way to Rome, where, on the day of Monsignor Montagnini's arrest, the guardian of the French Government archives in the Eternal City, M. Arnoux, had breathed his last. His papers were placed under seal by the French Embassy to the Quirinal about the same hour (on December 11) as the seals were being placed in Paris on Monsignor Montagnini's papers, and his corpse passed by the free prelate on the same Italian railway line on its way to the French capital.

Exactly three months passed. The last seventeen naval chaplains remaining of that body of priests—suppressed by a gradual process of extinction a few years ago, but whose term not being arrived, had been unexpectedly anticipated by sudden ministerial decree—com-

pleted their service and finally quitted fleet and dockyards in the afternoon of March 11. Accordingly, for the first time the French navy began the day of March 12, festival of the Pope St. Gregory the Great, without a single ecclesiastic or a single Mass. Immediately after the midday meal there occurred the sudden destruction of the Jena and 110 officers and seamen, a score of whom were so utterly consumed that no trace or particle whatever of them or their dress could be discovered.

These Divine warnings and punishments are commonly unheeded by the men who provoke them, however remarkable or awful they are. Hence it was not surprising to Christians of experience that strict orders were given by ministerial direction not to admit any priest to the naval hospital in Toulon, where the injured seamen and officers lay, unless indeed the wounded man expressly asked for one. Mr. Thomson—Freemason, Protestant and married to a Jewess—who is Minister of Marine, sent like orders to Rennes, in Brittany, where a Solemn Requiem for the dead sailors, many of whom were Bretons, was sung in the Cathedral on the 21st, prohibiting (at midnight preceding the function) the attendance at this Mass of any officer, seaman or official even in a private capacity.

On the day of the funeral in Toulon, the 16th March, after Mass in the crowded church the burial ceremonies were celebrated in the principal square, where the Prefecture stands (the Place d'Armes), and where a kiosque had been erected in its centre, by the Bishop, assisted by all the parochial clergy. The imposing function, which lasted an hour, was attended by naval representatives of England, Germany, Russia, the consuls of all foreign States having consulates in Toulon and delegations from municipalities of the city, of Marseilles and of most places in the department. The absolution having been given by the Bishop (of Frejus) and the coffins blessed, the cortege then started for the arsenal, and *not until then* did the Naval Prefect, the President of the Republic, the Premier, Clemenceau; the Ministers of War and Marine, the Vice Presidents of Senate and Chamber and the delegations from both, who had arrived from Paris the even before, make their appearance! The President Fallieres' wife and daughter attend Sunday Mass, but he (like most of his predecessors) never hears one. The writer already quoted in regard to decadence of his countrymen, remarks: "This cousin of a Bishop, this hypocrite who surpasses in ignominy Loubet himself, affects not to be able to cross the porch of a church where the dead are prayed for. These naval officers, who used to be pictured as lofty and noble characters, accept humbly all this. Such obedience is perhaps more alarming in view of the future than the revolt of workingmen who, braving authority by striking, show that at least there is blood in

their veins. By follies inconceivable, by insanities more contemptible, degrading and repugnant than any of their other acts, our governors are striving to the utmost to weaken our last supreme strength, to extinguish the very last flame. A day or two after one of those catastrophes that usually elevate and purify mankind through the involuntary meditations inspired by death, especially when tragical, these scoundrels prevent the priest from approaching these Breton seamen who, like our fathers, are Christians, as Christian as they are French. It is utter folly to suppose a people given over to such anarchy can exercise any action or influence, or count for anything whatever in the universe."

However, it is cheering to know Christians in Paris did not follow the lead of politicians in Toulon on Holy Thursday and Easter Sunday, when all the churches of the capital were magnificently adorned and crowded with worshipers. Many carriages drove from one to another before it was possible for their occupants to squeeze themselves past the thresholds. The parochial clergy are able to record numerous unexpected conversions or returns to the practice of religious duties, which they not unreasonably attribute to the effect produced on the average human mind and heart by the unscrupulous persecutions that distinguish this century, for which better things are still hoped by more sanguine persons than the present writer.

The most edifying feature in the Easter devotions was ths spectacle (which must have been a profitable object lesson to the thoughtful) of male communicants in thousands at Notre Dame. Another, that all Paris churches were almost as crowded at afternoon Vespers as in the morning. Another surprise was the increased numbers over last year's records. Yet worshipers at the Madeleine, the Trinity, St. Augustine's, St. Roch, St. Philippe du Roule, St. Louis d'Autin, St. Germain l'Auxerrois or even St. Vincent de Paul (all profusely decorated florally and provided with customary magnificent music) are not classes that must bear the brunt of the persecution. Wealthy or well-to-do people in Paris can and will help themselves to get what they desire, let governments (who seldom venture to interfere much with the upper ten anywhere) do their worst. It is the majority, *i. e.,* those with slender means, the poor, the helpless (such as conscript youth driven out of seminaries and wounded sailors), especially in country places or provincial towns, who are at the mercy of unscrupulous demagogues attained to the temporary dignity of law-makers as rewards for their successful careers of professors of zeal for toilers. Not ecclesiastics attached to fashionable churches, but the rural clergy, that peasant clergy which is the backbone of the French Church, and dispersed religious of the smaller congregations, are now silently enduring miseries that, if known,

must excite unmeasured indignation in the Protestant and Mohammedan worlds. For instance: At a small commune of Aube, where there is no resident priest, a pauper died whose daughter asked the priest of a neighboring commune what the fees would be for religious burial. "You have nothing to pay." At the hour and on the day fixed this priest presented himself, after a six-mile walk, to the weeping woman, who told him the Mayor having vowed the commune should not pay for coffin or bearers if the body entered a church, there must be a civil interment, the family being penniless. The sudden death on the eve of Passion Sunday of the parish priest at Manthelon (Tours diocese), who, a sufferer from heart disease, received then a notice to quit his presbytery on the Monday, is another case of mayoral brutality. On Good Friday a man of seventy died at Liffre, a commune near Rennes of 3,000 inhabitants, after refusing the sacraments. The priest accordingly refused Christian burial and was surprised on Easter Monday to see a funeral cortege, including Mayor and his deputies, enter the church with what turned out to be the old anti-clerical's corpse. He protested, some one cried, "This belongs to us; we can sleep here if we like," and the Mayor ordered one mourner to recite the rosary, another to toll the bell, saying to the priest, "If you won't do your duty, I will do mine." Consequent on this sacrilege the Archbishop, from Low Sunday (when three Low Masses were said), has suspended public worship in Liffre, one vicar being left in an adjoining commune for emergencies; the other and the parish priest are removed away.

When the three priests left the church 1,200 persons awaiting outside escorted them to the railway station, chanting hymns and crying "Vive Jesus Christ! Vive la Republique!" The Abbé Imblet, one of the vicars, with much feeling thanked the Catholics in the commune for their welcome spontaneous demonstration. After the train left with parish priest and vicars, the procession and its flag-bearers betook themselves to the Mayor's house, to manifest in other fashion. At the solicitation of the municipality the Bishop consented to raise this interdict and the church was reopened a fortnight afterwards.

The Mayor very soon afterwards thought it prudent to resign office. And in Angers diocese, the parish priest of Champ refusing to lease his presbytery on the terms fixed by the municipality, and threatening to quit the commune, a formidable popular demonstration resulted, during which the Mayor, despite his seventy years, was hustled, struck and was himself turned out of (his own) doors. Some time ago the Mayor of Lens, in the Nord, having prohibited "religious demonstrations" on public roads, a priest dared, notwithstanding, to go on foot vested to a house where a corpse awaited

burial with religious rites, and was prosecuted, but was acquitted by the local tribunal. The righteous decision being appealed against, was, in the last week of April, quashed by the high Court of Cassation.

Thus it is now declared to be illegal *for the poor* (because they cannot afford the expense of a carriage funeral) to have their dead escorted religiously to a cemetery in the land of equality! In the same land of liberty, in the same week, Colonel Septans, an "officer in reserve," was "suspended for a year" from his functions by the War Minister, General Picquart, for the offense of attending a Catholic demonstration protesting against the expulsion of his diocesan Bishop from the episcopal residence. This officer early last year retired into civil life after forty-two years' military service and an experience of many campaigns.

Twenty-seven Ursuline nuns at Nantes early in March were prosecuted there and condemned to pay fines amounting to $85 for the offense of obstinately persisting to live together as a religious community in what the prosecution and the judge admitted to be legally their own house, built long ago out of their own resources upon their own freehold land. This, although they had, as required by the law of 1901, ceased to carry on a school or to teach, which they were legally authorized in last century to do. They must, to obey the law in 1907, become homeless, though several are infirm or bedridden! Out of the 130,000 religious women dispersed a large proportion are absolutely penniless and friendless. Few indeed know anything of the world into which they are thus brutally flung. Legislation by African savages could scarcely be more barbarous at this time of day.[8]

The appeals against their dissolution and dispersion, which had been ordered in July, 1904 (*i. e.,* nearly three years ago), by decrees of the Minister of Interior under Combes—of the Congregation "Daughters of the Cross" and other congregations combining teaching with the boarding of "paying guests"—have at last been pronounced upon by the Council of State. This supreme tribunal annuls the decrees in question on the ground that the appellants prior to 1903 had ceased to teach, and there is no law to prevent their carrying on, as they were doing solely in 1904, the business of receiv-

[8] The same legal tribunal (correctional) at Marseilles, some weeks later, acquitted twelve defendants accused of reconstituting as a "free school" the boarding school in the Rue Hozier, which they used (prior to dissolution) to carry on together as the school of their religious congregation. The court found that the defendants, although formerly members of a dissolved congregation, could not be deemed to have reconstituted it from the mere fact of living together to teach. Here is "incoherence" between the two courts.

ing into their houses females of any age under the conditions laid down by their statutes.

The serious losses of Sisters, houses and means sustained by the congregations so illegally scattered and partially ruined, in particular, as I can testify, by the *Filles de la Croix,* of Treguier; Loudeac, Nagour and Guingamp, will not be recouped by M. Combes nor by his Minister of Interior nor by Clemenceau & Co.

This decision is, nevertheless, so far satisfactory; but, in the case of the Nantes Ursulines, who were so shortly before fined for daring to live together, teaching had been long given up, and unless their sentence be quashed the "incoherence" follows that religious may live together in their own house in the land of liberty, equality, fraternity only if they take in boarders; otherwise they must quit their country to live together! The boarders may be children, but cannot be taught!

The deplorable results of this persecution upon children of the struggling classes can be realized from a letter addressed in April 25 by the Bishop of Nancy to M. de Marcére, Senator and president of the French Patriotic League. Mgr. Turinaz says: "I applaud with my whole soul the contest waged by you and your friends against the perverters of children and youth in our country. It is impossible, I will not say for believers in any religious body, but for any man imbued with those principles, wanting which society and nations perish in dishonor, in bloodshed and in the gutter, to tolerate any longer the flagrant, impudent and perhaps soon to be universal violation of the professed neutrality of our schools. For large numbers of the masters and mistresses are now attacking and outraging not alone religious doctrines, but the great fundamental truths called by Cicero 'the patrimony of mankind;' the existence of God and the soul, the superiority of man over the unreasoning animal, his freedom and consequent responsibility, the essential distinction between truth and error, good and evil; all the living forces of our country in this present time, all its lofty, noble traditions in the past. There are in certain villages schoolmasters, and even schoolmistresses yet more unworthy and contemptible, who not merely inculcate envy, hatred, the setting class against class in social life and socialistic dreams, but have introduced the promiscuous mingling together of boys and girls of ten, eleven, twelve years on the same school benches. In one such school in a thoroughly Christian parish of my diocese the father of a child induced the Mayor to visit the school with him and rebuke the master for doing this. The answer they received was, 'Your beasts are well enough placed so in your stables.' These disgraceful words are a revelation, I might say a programme; for to bestiality do such masters seek to drive the French people.

Your appeal and organization deserve national gratitude. Jointly with your League, in which Catholics should take a large part, there should be a great league of all faithful men, all true liberals, all honest folk against the perverters of childhood and youth."

Many expulsed religious who have established themselves in England are conducting boarding schools there for children whose parents cannot bear to expose them to the new dangers besetting French youth in their own country. To part with their children for long periods thus is grievous sorrow to a French father and mother. Family and home life are cherished in France far more strongly than in England, where it is a common practice to send young people during several years away from the parental circle. Not so in France. But now the French Catholic parent feels that to preserve the faith and purity of his child he must send her across the frontier or the Channel. Accordingly, numerous Ursuline nuns, whose speciality has long been teaching for classes of limited means, have opened several boarding schools in England that are exclusively places of refuge for their expulsed Sisters and for French children, whose parents (in many cases barely able hitherto to make both ends meet) are thus forced to suffer other painful and arduous sacrifices by the tyrants who boast of and glorify "ancestral" precursors—Robespierre, Danton, Marat, *et hoc genus omne.*

In a report to Rome, which will appear in the White Book now preparing at the Vatican in full, by Mgr. Montagnini the prelate says: "The masses are not hostile to the Church; they are even sympathetic to a certain extent with us. In the provinces, in the North, Brittany, the Lozère, in Auvergne, Normandy, the people are believing; in Beauce, Champagne, Burgundy, indifferent; in country places generally the population are practical Catholics, less so in towns, still less so in manufacturing centres. Generally religious instruction is deplorable, Catholics are disunited, and the majority of practical Catholics belong to the aristocratic and well-to-do middle classes; though just now the freethinking wind appears sweeping the latter class away. Protestantism and its propaganda are spreading. Eleven per cent. of the magistracy are Protestant. In the Menilmontant quarter of Parish sixty per cent. of the children are unbaptized. The catechism is taught in Paris in rather a routine way, and instruction in it is so fragile that after First Communion the child forgets what principles he had been taught."

The Bishop of Digne, which is the poorest French diocese, writes when acknowledging a remittance in aid: "I have a modest second floor, no valet, only an old general female servant, and live economically. My priests astonish one by their poverty and self-denial. Were I to indulge in anything not necessary it would have to be at

their expense. You should see an average presbytery. Two dollars quarterly is not, for many of them, an unusual rent. Several occupants of such dwellings have had to quit theirs because the roof gave way or the rain came in, though in their hamlets of fifty or sixty people no other quarters could be had. Some parishes are half the year under snow, storms being so violent that weeks sometimes pass without anybody communicating with the outside world. People and priest must provide a store for the whole winter and make their own bread. Fortunately my clergy are industrious; they are accustomed to be content with little. One lives on $60 a year, giving for good works the rest of his stipend. Another does not trouble about the future, for, he says, his honorarium of a franc for Mass and another daily franc earned by his sister for working outside are enough for them. Some earn their bread by repairing clocks or watches or making beehives; others make knitted articles, work on the land or live by agriculture."

A Catholic association that has been formed is occupied in procuring necessary teaching or finding congenial work for clergy who may need thus to eke out grants which the Bishops may be enabled to make from proceeds of the fund they have organized, *Denier du Culte,* or worship penny. Still only priests who had been used to some handicraft of their father's, or to field and stable, before entering the Little Seminary, are likely to earn money by manual labor, which anyhow can be but a makeshift, a very temporary expedient to keep the wolf from the door. It is idle to quote St. Paul's determination to be "chargeable to no man" or his testimony that he and St. Timothy "in labor and in toil worked night and day, lest we should be chargeable to any of you," for he was an Apostle, his "beloved son" a Bishop. Neither saint was a parish priest. And the same extraordinary Apostle repeatedly affirmed that he had for an extraordinary purpose refrained from using the power and right he possessed, as do all parish priests possess it, since "the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel"—not by plowing, sowing, knitting or mending old shoes. Had the dispersed congregations kept steadily in mind the policy of the wise maxim, "every man to his own trade," it is highly questionable whether the Bloc and Grand Orient could have succeeded in enlisting enough of an acquiescent spirit in French public opinion to enable them to carry the associations law of 1901.

In Digne the despoilers could have got little or nothing. Let us see what they secured in two other dioceses. At Nancy the French rente devoted to pious uses that is confiscated represents a yearly revenue of $22,000, not reckoning rente devoted to charities or other uses, nor lands and buildings also "sequestrated."

In Orleans, besides the Bishop's palace, Monsignor Touchet enumerates as follows: "For our minor seminary of La Chapelle the Bishop in 1844 bought the land and began the building. This was continued by the next Bishop, Mgr. Dupanloup; by his successor, now Cardinal Coullié, and completed with the fine church built by the actual vicar general. In 1860 an old convent of minims was bought by the diocese and ceded for a grand seminary, that of Holy Cross, with its handsome chapel, old cloisters, fine class rooms and dormitories. For these two buildings the State never contributed a cent; the Catholic body did everything, paid for everything, from the ground itself to the building stone and the roofing slates. Not a nail in Sainte Croix, not a shrub or tree in La Chapelle can the State claim as its own. Nevertheless the State lays daring hand upon Holy Cross and La Chapelle; robbing the diocese of them, it takes them simply without ado.[9] The Grand Seminary owned in Orleans six houses given it with the consent and guarantee of the State for maintaining poor seminarists, besides some land in the suburbs; the State simply takes all this property. The Grand Seminary also possessed with the same State consent and guarantee, for the same mainatenance of poor seminarists, rente inscribed in the State ledgers as payable to specific persons (not to bearer). The State simply takes the whole, producing $2,200 yearly. A house bought by the diocese with its own money, another bequeathed to us—both are simply taken by the State. Rente of $800 yearly for supporting aged infirm priests, the State simply takes. Capital for providing foundations of 17,217 Masses for the dead the State simply takes. Having 'taken' goods of the living, the State takes likewise goods of the dead. Goods of the poor, of the invalid clergy, of the departed, the State takes, takes; takes all. 'Ill-gotten goods profit little,' says the proverb. Does the proverb refer only to individuals? For the sake of my country, I wish it did. But with history before me I cannot doubt it concerns States, too, and the thought terrifies me."

The enormous difficulties in repairing some of the evil wrought are apparent from the ensuing account of what has been done towards reconstituting grand seminaries, whereof every one in France by the middle of February was dissolved, dispersed and completely evacuated by students and *personnel.* Indeed, by that time some had twice (within two months) been subjected to these legal

[9] This is what the French republican State has done throughout France in the dawn of the twentieth century. Its cordial ally, one hour's steaming from Calais, whose statesmen and journalists for generations lectured the world as though its unique teachers were apostles of freedom, justice and the rights of property—every Briton's house being his castle—has been dumb while these deeds of darkness were being done. Only two or three newspapers (after all was over) denounced the iniquities.

outrages, viz., a few whose occupants after a first expulsion had returned under rights of lease of the premises from the former Seminary Bureau. For the vital importance to the Church of those essential organs of life, its seminaries, is felt to call for repair of the mischief perpetrated without an instant's loss of time; hence a reconstitution began from the 15th December last that will go on indefatigably as dissolution follows each reconstitution. One difficulty encountered at once is the choice of a place; a second is the legal basis for the proposed teaching; and in many dioceses a solution of the first is not yet discovered, the seminarists in the meantime being scattered in all directions. In some, albeit, what could be got has had to be put up with; though the situation is less bad, it is not free from much that is inconvenient. Dwellings separated from teaching rooms are often too small for the number of youths, who have to be divided among two, three, four houses, while everywhere, cells being too few, sleeping has had to be arranged in dormitories and work to be done in common hall. Then, the seminaries having lost all their regular resources, the regime of living is so poverty-stricken as to verge on misery. As to the legal basis whereon it has been obligatory to reorganize without delay the system of teaching, rules, with the Supreme Pontiff's approval, have had to be settled according to the laws applicable. With a few hesitations at the outset all the grand seminaries are being, or will be, organized under the law of 1875, and in "establishment" form, very rarely in "private course" form. Persons interested can obtain information from the secretary of the "Alliance des Seminaires" at their office, 74 Rue de Vaugirard, Paris.

On this footing the seminaries have, in a large majority, as best they could, contrived to reopen. But one important difficulty in the way is still without solution, viz., their legal right to possess! This can only be certainly secured by creating regular associations legally entitled to own freeholds and movable property. As matters stand there is much uncertainty whether such a legal right is enjoyed. Briefly, summarily, everything has yet to be done, and the good-will of Catholics able to coöperate has many more channels for its exercise in the work than they can fancy. For many a long day yet the zeal, the material activity, the practical devotion of the faithful, clerical and lay, will be necessary to maintain and restore what their bitter foe is bent on destroying.

This account is translated from a paper by M. Lorphand in the *Univers:* "The wasteful extravagance in dealing with its ill-gotten gear displayed by the plunderers is exemplified by their utilization for accommodating sixty girls from the Ecole Normale (or Normal School) of St. John's School, Versailles, valued at $120,000, a mag-

nificent establishment built by the dissolved Eudist Fathers, who boarded 300 youths there."

A couple of hours elapsed from the moment of penning the last paragraph when the news from Rome, dated April 6, reached this writer: "Monsignor Montagnini is appointed Apostolic Protonotary. Cardinal Merry del Val instead of resigning (as one consequence of the publication by M. Clemenceau of portions of the seized Papal archives) continues to enjoy the entire confidence of the Pope and the Sacred College."

Simultaneously there arrived in print what is doubtless a true copy of a despatch marked "very confidential," from the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican February 27, 1906, to Monsignor Montagnini in Paris, desiring the prelate to tell Cardinal Richard (the Archbishop) that the Holy Father up to that date had no thought or intention of accepting the separation law "worship associations." This was to be communicated to the Cardinal-Archbishop "in the most absolute secrecy;" and violation of the secret was the handiwork of M. Clemenceau with the prefect of police, M. Lepine, on December 11 last. Its publication in the *Autorité* before three months is the doing of the Premier. From this important document, which will surely redound in the minds of all intelligent fair thinkers outside France, whether Catholic or anti-Catholic, to the highest credit and advantage of its writer and of Pius X., the following weighty expressions and indications of Papal views and aims appropriately conclude this paper, pending the announced publication as soon as practicable of a second White Book devoted to a faithful copy of the whole correspondence so violently captured in the Nunciature Hotel owned by the Pope in Paris. Cardinal Merry del Val wrote then, long before the elections that were mostly won by the Bloc of indifferents, anti-clericals and anti-Christians:

"I am greatly disquieted because I clearly see we are now at a historical turning point in the history of the Church Universal. The whole forces of evil, of international Masonry, are opposed to the Church, and in this struggle France is found in the front rank. What shall be done in France shall serve as an example to all other peoples. On this account the decisions that shall be arrived at will be of utmost importance. Evidently, if the majority of French Bishops pronounce for a practical trial of the separation law, it will be difficult for the Pope, although assured of their obedience, to command action contrary to their convictions. But it is false, most false, that the Pope, if he be supported by the views of a sufficient number of these Bishops, is not ready to proclaim resistance. The Pope awaits the Bishops' opinion before pronouncing the final word. Each will be able to state his personal opinion."

Shortly after Easter the Councils Generals assembled. Each department has it own, consisting of the Deputies, Senators and other local notabilities, who are elected by a select body in order to look after local interests. The Council General of Maine et Loire listened sympathetically to an eloquent opening discourse by its president, Monsieur Grignon, denouncing the religious persecution, "so disastrous to the country," and severely reproaching the Prefect for his ill-judged intervention at the siege of Beaupreau Seminary (described on page 178), "which all but provoked a revolution in the district and the Cholet region." After a heated discussion between the Prefect and the Duke of Blacas, supported by other members, the Council unanimously approved the declaration by its president that he was "bound to protest energetically against the consequences of laws violating rights of conscience and deeply troubling their provincial populations."

The Aveyron Council General, after a long debate, voted (by 28 against 3) that the episcopal residence at Rodez be leased to the Bishop for eighteen years from July 1 at a rental of $300 annually, all important repairs to be at the charge of the department. The municipality had offered twice that rental for the premises—built by Bishops of Rodez and now of high artistic value. The Haute-Marne Council General voted a request to government that the interest of moneys or investments confiscated be placed at the disposal of the parties interested, "in order that wishers of testators and donors be respected." On the other side, the Council General of the wealthy manufacturing and mining department of the Nord, which contributes seven per cent. of the country's total taxation, voted a motion, proposed by Socialist Councillors, demanding suppression of Catholic faculties at Lille University.

On May 7 and 8 will be celebrated at Orleans the annual national commemoration of Joan of Arc. Accordingly a month previously M. Clemenceau officially forbade all State functionaries to attend or take any part in these *fêtes* because, the Premier said, eleven Bishops will be present. He could not prevent the proceedings, which are the business of the Orleans municipality, but in the land of liberty he can prevent any participation in these national rejoicings by the army, magistrature, the universities, functionaries high and low, from postmen to Ministers, and used his power, disregarding the pressing remonstrances of the Radical Deputy for Orleans, who is a brother Freemason high in rank. The aged General Charette at once addressed an eloquent appeal to all his companions in arms of 1870, inviting their attendance at Orleans on May 8 to salute the heroine and supplicate her to drive out of beautiful France all its enemies, "whoever they may be."

Never did the city wear such a gloomy aspect as during this year's festival, which is fittingly styled "a mourning procession in a dead city." It was practically a military affair, the official *corps* of Magistrates, Judges, professors, delegates from Chamber of Commerce, etc., being surrounded by troops, the Court of Appeal Judges, for instance, being protected by forty soldiers under a lieutenant. The *cortège,* preceded by a picket of gendarmes, a squadron of chasseurs and two sub-divisions of fire brigade men, began with a group of Freemasons thirty in number, whereof only seven Orleans citizens, one Paris and one full-blooded Negro Mason, never before seen in the city any more than had been a few Jewish featured brethren. Besides the troops, these thirty, who marched with an uneasy air, were protected by police in uniform and in plain clothes. The only Masonic emblem was a branch of artificial acacia worn in a buttonhole. Next came some local societies, municipal council, two Senators, four Deputies, the general commanding, the Prefect, President of Appeal Court, and then diverse functionaries and *corps,* with several detachments of different troops. In the Rue Jeanne d'Arc, where customarily from end to end there was profusion of drapery and flags, every house, excepting two so decorated (the State College and the residence of the central commissary), had its shutters close-drawn; and the same was the situation in the Rue Royale excepting only three cafés, a librarian's and three dressmakers' shops. Madame Bruchon, the Mayor's daughter, has a hide and skin warehouse in this street, and when the municipal group approached it the crowd saw this lady advance to the window and herself draw down the iron shutters closing its front, the Mayor outside turning pale and frowning as he passed. An explosive petard was thrown into the Masonic group, who scattered affrighted in all directions, but no damage was done.

In afternoon and evening games and fireworks attracted the country people. When these were over and the city was deserted, its sad, mourning, closed aspect returned. The greater part of its well-to-do population had left it the previous week instead of receiving as guests for the festival friends and relatives from without; accordingly Orleans "commerce" is furious and "Catholicity" is disgusted.

M. Clemenceau, an eminent Freemason himself, not content with arbitrary ministerial interference with State servants' rights, promptly proceeded to stir up his sect to harass Catholic clergy and laity in regard to commemorations one would naturally suppose in no way interested Masons otherwise than as objects for ridicule by aproned anti-Christians.

On November 21, 1894, their generalissimo, the notorious Italian

Jew Lemmi, circularized French lodges: "The eternal adversaries of reason and progress wish to glorify an hysterical girl whose existence was a bigoted and vicious fraud, and hold her up to universal admiration. French *chauvins* for some time past have used her name as a standard. We invite our French initiated brethren to resist this priestly agitation under the name of Joan of Arc. The movement must by every means be paralyzed. Give orders accordingly everywhere, and point out how association with this Joan glorification under pretext of patriotism is really to fall into clerical snares. We date this encyclical *voûte* on the anniversary of the immortal Voltaire. Written, given and signed in solemn *voûte* the 1st day of the moon Nisan, being 17th day of the 2d month of the year of True Light 000894." (Translated from "The Jew as Sectarian" by L. Vial.) And on February 2, 1898, eve of a debate in the French Chamber upon a petition for appointing a yearly national festival in honor of Joan, the "Venerable" Monteil, from the "Orient of Paris, 2 February, year CVI.," circularized all French Freemasons: "We entreat you, dear brethren, declining sordid compromises, to prevent the institution of the proposed national festival. This Clement Friendship Lodge has repeatedly opposed energetically the proposal. We cried and still cry, 'This is clerical reaction. It would be a festival of civil war.' We count upon your opposition." ("Le Juif Sectaire," by L. Vail.) Upon which "the Convent" adopted as its own the following resolution: "The Lodge of the True Friends felicitates the Clement Friendship Lodge for having initiated a protest against instituting a national Joan of Arc festival. Considering Joan lived at a time when our country did not yet exist, and that the very idea of country was not formulated in France until long afterwards; that this personality is before all things legendary, and could not from any point of view be a concrete figure of our country of France, such as the apologists of the festival try to make people believe in; considering, further, that a national Joan of Arc festival would be an anachronism as opposed to historic truth as to popular tradition—for these reasons the True Friends Lodge energetically protests against the institution of a national festival styled Joan of Arc *fête*, which would be an outrage on historic truth, a pretext for machinations by the Church, a cause of internal troubles, a menace to liberty of conscience, a defiance to republican France and to free thought." By these three documents the attitude of Freemasonry is so authoritatively, clearly defined officially that, while formidable, unscrupulous, opposition to this year's commemoration of the Maid of Orleans was expected as a matter of course, nobody could have anticipated the sect—hypocritical fundamentally and radically destitute of real principle though it is—would play the part

that shall be concisely described at the instigation of the demagogue who so unworthily fills a place occupied in all other important countries by sagacious statesmen.

But the old saying teaches us circumstances alter cases, so no surprise was felt when the public learned that on Sunday, April 28, 1907, 200 Freemasons, half of them Orleans citizens, had assembled to consider a letter from the Mayor to the "Venerable" of the local lodge. This letter was an urgent appeal for the sake of the "liberal traditions" of the sect, to facilitate arrangements for the city's annual commemoration by refraining from attending in the street procession as a Masonic body. After lengthy deliberations the lodge unanimously decided to demand officially place in the said procession for the Masonic body as such, the alleged reason for this unwelcome decision being an episcopal declaration made about ten days previously by Monsignor Touchet that His Lordship and clergy could participate in this essentially religious procession (which dates from A. D. 1429) only if allowed the customary processional cross; and, secondly, to halt as usual for prayers before a cross (not yet demolished by the iconoclasts) at a spot in the route historically associated with the English defeat by the inspired Maid; and, thirdly, if assured there would be no official Masonic association with the procession.

Various proposed anti-clerical modifications or abandonments of the usual ceremonial the Bishop had courteously, while regretting the departures from practices consecrated by long usage, consented to accept.

On the next day, April 29, the Municipal Council deliberated on the Masonic demand. Fourteen members voted for acceding to it, fourteen for rejecting it, whereupon the Mayor voted in its favor and for inviting as well any other association hitherto not represented at the commemorations. Of course, it was thus rendered impossible for the Bishop and clergy to take any part. For the first time the sacred cross must be absent, must be replaced by Masonic fripperies.

A brief resumé of proceedings and negotiations during the three weeks preceding this final municipal enunciation of Christ for Barabbas will set the true motives of the parties concerned in better light. On the 12th of April M. Clemenceau made an officious announcement that encouraged these Orleans Masons to apply to the Mayor on the 14th for permission to participate in the procession that is so emphatically stigmatized in the foregoing quotations from M. Vial's book. The application was made, they say, in a manifesto, because the lodge considered neutralization of the commemoration would constitute "a philosophic progress," wherefore, though Masons "are not accustomed to participate in public ceremonies, they

could, and should, by their presence associate Masonry with this official consecration of mutual toleration and liberty of conscience."

This Pecksniffian rhodomontade, far from impressing the Mayor, caused him to convene next day, 15th, a special meeting of the municipality, which drafted at his instances an urgent letter to M. Clemenceau representing: "We have learned with profound regret your decision prohibiting this year's celebration of the Joan of Arc festival in the customary fashion. Our citizens are attached to this patriotic anniversary, consecrated by usage, and whose special, unique character yearly attracts to our city numerous strangers, the source for local commerce of most important profits. Tradition requires each of us to forget, for that anniversary, yesterday's dissensions in order to salute with united energy and harmony the heroine who saved France. Those material interests, these imperishable souvenirs your decision seriously affects, and local feeling is therefore greatly stirred." This document, unanimously voted, was replied to by the Premier next day, 16th, in an ironical, sardonic letter of considerable length, assuring the municipality, the presidents of the Chamber of Commerce, the union of Loiret syndicates and the syndicates of commerce and industry, as well as the two Radical Deputies of Orleans, that their joint representations (whereof the principal passages are given above) had been read by him "with the greatest attention." "The social evolution," said M. Clemenceau, "can be achieved only by a progressive abandonment of certain 'customary forms,' of certain 'traditions.' Now, by voting separation of the Church from the State, Parliament and Republic renounced one of those 'customary forms,' one of those secular 'traditions.' This grand new fact has changed many other things than arrangements of a mere procession. We are all bound to accept its natural consequences loyally. If Orleans commerce needs religious ceremonies, allow me to tell you that ought to have been thought of before the separation law was voted. But, far from cherishing any such apprehensions last year, the city of Orleans, which had two Deputies, only one of whom voted against it, replaced that one after the project became law by a partisan of the new state of things. We are, therefore, it would seem, agreed about the principle. How, then, can you ask government to do what you did not wish to do yourselves?" Negotiations between the Mayor and the Bishop followed, during the course of which M. Clemenceau declared the Freemasons must be allowed to join the cortège if they desired; but the prelate announcing the Church's irreducible minimum (which included exclusion of Freemasonry), the Mayor replied on the 26th to the local lodge's application of the 14th of April by a categorical refusal to accede to it, a refusal denounced by the recipients as

"injustice, iniquity, flagrant violation of popular rights in a lay republican city." Three days later this same Mayor gave way, though he had declared he could "not understand the Premier's interference in a celebration that would be useless and meaningless if it did not preserve its traditional character." This weak-kneed Mayor, M. Courtin-Rossignol, whose conduct down to the 28th of April was perfectly fair and correct, is now said to be also a Freemason. Such is the calibre of public men in France to-day. "We are the sons of the Crusaders," gravely affirmed Montalembert!

In a neighboring village, Crécy, seven miles from Orleans, with a railway station, Joan slept the night before freeing Orleans from the foreigner, and it has been customary to piously celebrate her anniversary there also. This year, on Sunday, 5th, and Monday, 6th of May, had to resort thither pious crowds from Orleans for religious ceremonies of which Orleans is deprived, much to the dissatisfaction and indignation of its population. They were regaled instead on Tuesday, 7th, and Wednesday, 8th, with an exclusively lay, military and civil perambulation of the ordinary route; though, as the Mayor on April 30 reminded the Bishop, His Lordship could "not entirely keep aloof from the festival," wherefore it was settled that on Sunday, 12th of May, the civil "rejoicings" being over, Bishop and clergy would, in the Cathedral where Joan prayed, "fulfill their duty of preserving the memory of the religious mystery, lacking which the inspired liberating Maid of Orleans becomes wholly inexplicable."

Monsignor Touchet closed his letter (on April 30) with an assurance that: "Later, this festival of fraternity and tradition will be reëstablished, for, history tells us, such has always been the course of events."

The banner of the heaven-sent Maid was not included in the inventory taking, and is in safe custody waiting the fulfillment of monsignor's forecast. As to his casting vote on the wrong side, which converted the ancient Catholic celebration into a purely civil perambulation of streets, the Mayor assured the Bishop it was given solely from business motives. His exact words, literally translated, are: "Apart from religious considerations, my duty as Mayor was to regard the material interests of my fellow-citizens; that reflection alone, setting aside my personal sentiments, influenced my decision to vote for a purely civil festival in honor of Joan of Arc."

On the other hand, the "Orelans free-thinking group," meeting together on the 28th, resolved an expression of "regret that associations claiming to exercise free thought forget its fundamental principles so far as to demand place in a religious procession beside those of whom they profess to be the foes." As for General Charette, he

could not wait idly in Orleans for a fortnight, and invited Pontifical Zouaves and other comrades to honor Joan in Rouen.

On April 11 the Abbé Jouin, parish priest of St. Augustin's, Paris, was tried at the Correctional Tribunal by the president of the section, assisted by two other Magistrates, one being a Jew, the advocate prosecuting on behalf of the Ministry of Justice being a Protestant. The charge was a breach of the separation law by publishing in his parish *Bulletin* "a direct provocation to resist the execution of laws or of lawful procedure by public authority and calculated to excite hostility between citizens or to arm a part of our citizens against another part." In announcing a mourning Mass on December 12, 1906, the day that, the paragraph stated, "will consummate the apostasy of official France and its rupture with the Church, which it will henceforth only know as an object for persecution," the abbé had said: "War has begun; let us wage it valiantly like Christians. Our mourning, however sad and profound it may be, *must be an armed mourning*. To keep the faith is not enough. We must defend it." The defendant pleaded that energetic resistance of an unjust law was what he intended to urge as a duty, but repudiated any intention of suggesting use of other armor than the helmet, shield and sword St. Paul exhorted Christians to assume for the good fight of faith; and the Court, accepting this view instead of the interpretation alleged by the prosecution, nevertheless, after an adjournment until the 13th of April, condemned the abbé to pay a fine of 16 francs on grounds stated by the presiding Judge as follows:

"In law the defense would have prevailed, were it not that the separation law of 1905 has made a penal offense any provocation to resistance thereof *by a minister of worship*, and independently of all anterior prescriptions of our penal code. From explanations made by the mover in the Chamber before the voting of that law it is clear that it is now inadmissible for a priest in a sermon to the faithful to incite them to resist its execution. Those explanations were accepted as its own intention by the Chamber in voting the law, so that to invoke anterior precedents is useless. The law of 1905 regards as 'incitement to resist' any provocation to resist in principle its provisions without there being any need to have distinctly specified any particular act of resistance in the discourse or the writing impugned. The reproach addressed by the prosecution to the defendant of advising acts of violence when using the expression 'armed mourning' is groundless, since the phrase does not mean materially armed, but only means a persistent will to create objections and set up obstacles in hindrance of the law's operating, and by such obstacles to prevent its due execution."

Thus, while any citizen except a priest may so resist the new law unscathed, a priest only is punished by the law. Is this or is it not persecuting the clergy?

The Minister of Justice has appealed to the Court of Cassation against this judgment, alleging the grounds for the decision are improperly and inadequately stated! It is generally believed government carry that Court of Cassation in the pocket, or at beck and call at any rate. If the judgment be quashed, there may be a retrial, should the Clemenceau Cabinet last and consider it politic to keep the business open; otherwise the affair will be quietly dropped. It is not hard to perceive the vast importance to Masonic government and Bloc of getting this remarkable judgment annulled for the precise reasons given.

I submit the judgment supplies solid ground for parliamentary and other action to obtain annulment of the separation law of December, 1905, as being *ultra vires* constitutionally. The French Constitution confers the rights of free speech and of free press upon French citizens, while that law deprives a class—the clergy—as appears from this judgment, of both rights. Now, a parliamentary majority clearly cannot legislate contrary to the Constitution of the Republic! Therefore the whole "law" is illegal surely.

J. F. Boyd.

Plymouth, England.

THE MEN OF THE GREAT SYNAGOGUE.

Such is the name given by the Jews to the great council assembled at Jerusalem by Ezra the Priest, its president after the Babylonian exile. By its aid and support he restored the whole Church of Jerusalem and Judæa, purged it of many corruptions, faults and vices contracted in Babylon, and constructed it afresh. . . . Ezra and Nehemiah associated with themselves certain other of the more noble and learned of the people, so that the entire council, or ecclesiastical senate, embraced the number of 120 men.—*Buxtorf: Tiberias.*

TOWARDS the end of the Fourth Book of Kings we read of the unconditional surrender of the King of Juda to the powerful Babylonian army which appeared before the wall of Jerusalem under the command of Nabuchodonosor. This leader had already defeated the Egyptian host and broken their power, and now for a time at least the ascendancy was to remain with the Chaldæan. The ambition of the Egyptians was thus suddenly crushed and they saw the land which they had held as far as the Euphrates pass out of their dominion to augment the vast wealth of the King of Babylon. The overthrow of Egypt left Palestine an easy prey

to the foreign army, and Joachim of Juda soon became a vassal of Nabuchodonosor. For three years Joachim was loyal to his new lord, but then he revolted, perhaps at the instigation of Pharao Necho, and in 597 the Chaldæan forces, aided by bands of Syrians, Moabites and Ammonites, came against him. From the Books of Kings and Paralipomenon it is not an easy matter to gather what was the immediate outcome of this encounter; this at least is clear, that the King of Juda was succeeded on the throne by his son, also called Joachim. After but a brief reign of three months the victorious army of Babylon under the personal leadership of their King came to assault the city of Jerusalem. Joachim, seeing that resistance was useless, went out with his mother and the seniors and nobles to offer his submission to his enemy; and with him he carried all the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the King's house.[1] He himself, with many thousands of the people, were led captives to Babylon, and over the remnant Matthanias, the uncle of Joachim, was appointed King in Jerusalem, his name being changed to Sedecias.[2]

During the nine years that followed this event Juda and its new King were entirely subject to the sway of Babylon, and it had been well for them if they had willingly submitted to the foreign yoke in accordance with the reiterated advice of Jeremias. But again the standard of revolt was raised and retribution was quick to follow; for Nabuchodonosor came forth from his royal city and all his army with him to finally crush the power of Juda. On this occasion King Sedecias was taken prisoner to Babylon, to be soon followed by the remnant of the people. The walls of the city were broken down; the temple, the King's palace and the other buildings set in flames. Treasures that were not burnt were taken away to adorn the Chaldæan capital.[3]

The captivity lasted, we are told, till the reign of the King of Persia.[4] It would be interesting to know the manner of life followed by the Jews during these years, their relations with their idolatrous conquerors, the degree of freedom with which they were allowed to practice the religion of Jahveh. It would be pleasing to know whether they carried with them into the strange land the sacred books containing the law of God and their historical records, or whether these were all destroyed when the city was fired by the Chaldæans. Possibly they were saved from the flames by Seraias, the High Priest, Sophonias, the second priest, and the three doorkeepers whom the general of the army led away among the cap-

[1] IV. Kings xxiv., 13.
[2] *Ibid*, 17.
[3] IV. Kings xxv.
[4] II. Paralipomenon xxxvi., 20.

tives,[5] or possibly they were entrusted to the poor of the land, husbandmen and dressers of vines, who were left the sole guardians of the land against the day of return. History has not preserved for us the answer, and it is in the endeavor to trace the history of the sacred text about this period that we meet with the Talmudic Tradition of the Men of the Great Synagogue.

When again we take up the history of Juda we have as our guide the Book of Esdras, which opens with the proclamation of Cyrus, King of Persia, in favor of the exiles. Babylon had now passed away from the Chaldæans, and one of the first acts of its new sovereign was to *"shepherd"* the people of God and to allow them to return to their native land. Many thousands[6] availed themselves of this royal concession, and they brought back with them the vessels of gold and silver belonging to the temple to the number of 5,400.[7] It was probably in the year 536 B. C. that the people returned from exile under the guidance and leadership of Zorobabel,[8] the son of Salathiel.

The first care of the chief of the people was to reconstruct the temple of the Lord. The manner in which from the beginning the old accustomed rites and ceremonies were duly performed, and this many years before the arrival of Esdras in the city, suggests that through the years of the captivity the law of Jahveh had lived in the hearts of the people and had been handed down from the fathers who went into exile to their offspring, who returned the same way seventy years later and were again rejoicing in their newly acquired freedom. But even more than this: various references to the written law and to other documents prove that either during those days of trouble they had kept the sacred books in their midst, or in their leisure hours had committed again to writing what may have been destroyed at the capture of the city. Then in the list of those that accompanied Zorobabel we read of certain families "who sought the writing of their genealogy and found it not, and they were cast out of the priesthood."[9] The word translated *writing* in the original is Katab,[10] and refers to the priestly book called "the enrolled" or "the register." Thus, for instance, in Ezech. xiii., 9, the same word occurs and is used of the "register" of the House of Israel. It would appear, therefore, that the priestly registers at least had been preserved. A further reference, however, is also made to the written law, for we are told that an altar was built "that they might

[5] IV. Kings xxv., 18.
[6] Close on to 50,000, according to I. Esdras ii., 64-65.
[7] *Cf.* I. Esdras i., 11.
[8] *Cf.* I. Esdras iii., 2.
[9] I. Esdras ii., 62.
[10] The same word occurs in I. Esdras iv., 7, where it means "a letter."

offer holocausts upon it, as it is written in the law of Moses, the man of God."[11]

Another interval of some seventy years now occurs in the narrative of the people of God. Not all the exiles and their families had returned to Jerusalem in accordance with the permission granted by Cyrus. But further exodus was made during the reign of Artaxerxes, when Esdras "went up from Babylon . . . with some of the children of Israel, and of the children of the priests, and of the children of the Levites, and of the singing men, and of the porters, and of the Nathinites to Jerusalem."[12]

Esdras himself was a "velox scriba."[13] "He had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord and to do and to teach in Israel the commandments and judgment."[14] Not long after the first return from Babylon many of the people had fallen away from the teaching of the prophets and had joined in unlawful wedlock with the neighboring tribes. In language taken from the Book of Deuteronomy (vii., 3) Esdras rebuked his fellow-countrymen for their sin and succeeded for a time in reëstablishing the literal observance of the law, so that many were ready to put away their "strange wives." The work of reform, however, soon relaxed until the advent of Nehemias, the son of Helchias. He was cupbearer in the palace of Artaxerxes, and moved by the depressing news that reached him from Jerusalem he asked and obtained permission to pay a short visit to his people.[15] Fired with fresh enthusiasm, the citizens undertook the renovation of the city walls, so long neglected, and soon brought the work to completion in spite of the opposition of the neighboring tribes, who strove to prevent the breaches in the wall from being filled in.

The story of Nehemias' labor is told in this Second Book of Esdras. Having finished the circuit of the city walls and built towers and placed watchmen, Nehemias began the work of moral reform, and in this he found a ready and willing ally in the person of Esdras, who again came forward as the exponent of the law of Jahveh. The people gathered together as one man to the street which is before the water gate and spoke to Esdras the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses.[16] And on the first day of the civil year Esdras the priest brought the law before the multitude of the men and the women and all those that could understand and read it plainly from morning until midday. And the ears of all the

[11] I. Esdras iii., 2.
[12] I. Esdras vii., 6-7.
[13] I. Esdras vii., 6.
[14] I. Esdras vii., 10.
[15] II. Esdras i., ii.
[16] II. Esdras viii., 1.

people were attentive to the book. The work of interpretation was undertaken by Esdras and Nehemias and the scribes, and thus in solemn assembly day by day for seven days the Book of the Law was read aloud. And on the eighth day they made a solemn covenant with God to observe the law they had heard and understood, and the covenant was formally sealed and signed by Nehemias and the chosen representatives of the priesthood and the people.

It was necessary to give this sketch of the history of the period in order to understand the questions that gather round the tradition of the "Great Synagogue." Indeed, it would seem that this tradition has arisen from the account of the assembly given in chapters 8, 9 and 10 of the Second Book of Nehemias, to which reference has already been made. That Esdras did good and lasting work for the transmission and preservation of the sacred text seems most probable, and most likely in his work of reform he had some chosen men to help him; but we have not sufficient trustworthy evidence to convince us that he founded the permanent body of men known in the Talmudic writings as the Great Synagogue.

"The 'Great Synagogue' according to Jewish tradition," says Driver,[17] "was a permanent council established by Ezra, which continued to exercise authority in religious matters till about 300 B. C. But the statements respecting it are obscure and vague; already critics of the last century doubted whether such a permanent body ever existed, and in the opinion of many modern scholars all that is told about it is fiction, the origin of which lies in the narrative (Neh. viii., 10) of the convocation which met at Jerusalem and subscribed the covenant to observe the law."

Previous to the Christian era the Old Testament text was secure in the hands of the "Scribes," but it is impossible to trace the rise and early history of these guardians of the sacred writings. Yet, on the other hand, there was undoubtedly a time when Israel ceased to number prophets among its teachers. The law had been given and God's dealings with His people explained and justified by the prophets, and these now passed away, leaving to others to carry on the traditions of Israel and to see the fulfillment of the written law. History does not record the manner in which the interval between the last of the prophets and the first of the scribes was bridged over. Nor is it till about A. D. 200 that we find an attempt made to supply this want that must have been felt by all who cared to study the history of the text from the time of Esdras to that date. The reference occurs in the Mishnic tract Abuth, and the following is the translation of this important document as given the edition of the "Talmud" (page 1) by Rodkinson:

[17] Introduction to "Lit. of Old Testament," xxxiii.

"Moses received the law on Sinai and delivered it to Joshua; Joshua in turn handed it down to the elders. From the elders it descended to the prophets, and each of them delivered it to his successors until it reached the men of the Great Synagogue. The last named originated three maxims: 'Be not hasty in judgment; bring up many disciples, and erect safeguards for the law.' (Page 22.) Simeon the Just was one of the remnants of the Great Assembly. His motto was, 'The order of the world rests upon three things: on law, on worship and on bestowal of favours.' (Page 27.) Antigonus of Socho, who received it from Simeon the Just was in the habit of saying (page 27): 'Be not like slaves, etc.' The "Pairs" of Jewish scribes preceding Hillel and Shaminai are then enumerated.

This, then, is our earliest evidence of the existence of the Great Synagogue, and the testimony amounts to this, that in the chain of tradition from Moses to the scribes of the second century B. C. the Great Synagogue intervened between the prophets of the "Pairs" of scribes and that Simon the Just was its last surviving member. It is the only Mishnic evidence we have of the existence of this Great Synagogue; the rest of the Talmudic testimony is Gemara and therefore not earlier than the fourth, fifth or sixth centuries A. D.

Against this testimony, if such it may be called, we may balance another piece of evidence, also Mishnic, in which there is no mention of the Great Synagogue as the link between the prophets and the scribes. It occurs in the treatise called Peah (corner tithes), in which minute instructions are given concerning the tithes to be paid for grain. It would appear that these tithes were assessed with reference to the number of angles in the field. The passage may be translated as follows: "Rabbi Innion the Masphatite, when he had sown two sorts of grain in his field, chanced to question R. Gamaliel what he ought to do in that case concerning (the corner tithe). The rabbi, not knowing what answer to give, they betook themselves to the tribunal to seek a solution. Nahum the scribe said it was received from Rabbi Moses, who received it from Rab (*i. e.,* Rabbi Ichudah), who received it from 'Pairs,' who received it from the prophets, that in accordance with the Mosaic ordinance and tradition from Mount Sinai, if a man sow two kinds of grain, he must pay for it double the corner tithe if it is separated into two, but not so in the contrary case."

It will be observed that here the chain of tradition from Moses to the later days of the scribes does not contain the Great Synagogue as one of its links. This piece of evidence is important, inasmuch as it weakens considerably the only other early testimony we have for the existence of this body of men. Had such an influential assembly really existed and labored with Esdras in the establish-

ment and transmission of the Torah after the return from the exile some mention of it must have been made during the six or seven centuries that intervened before the Rab committed to writing the Mishna. Yet we find no reference to it in the Apocrypha written during that period; the books of the Macchabees contain no allusion to it; neither Josephus nor Philo seem to have known of its existence. The first of these writers would surely have made some allusion in his "Antiquities of the Jews" to a permanent body of men which, if we are to believe the modern upholders of that theory, played such an important part in the religious and social life of the nation during the whole period of the Persian dominion over Judæa. Yet nowhere does Josephus even hint at the "men of the Great Synagogue." In his work against Apion written to establish the antiquity of the Jews and the trustworthiness of their early history, Josephus rather implies that from the time of Artaxerxes to his own day there had existed no permanent body of men such as would be required by the theory of the Great Synagogue. (Pages 1 and 8.) "For we have not," he says, "myriads of discordant and conflicting books, but twenty-two only, comprising the record of all time, and justly accredited as Divine. Of them five are the books of Moses, which embrace the laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind until his own death, a period of almost 3,000 years. From the death of Moses to the death of Artaxerxes the prophets who followed Moses narrated the events of their own time in thirteen books. The remaining four consist of hymns to God and maxims of conduct for men. From Artaxerxes to our own age the history has been written in detail; but it is not considered worthy of the same credit on account of the exact succession of the prophets having been no longer maintained."

Thus far, then, we have found only one piece of evidence testifying to the existence of the "Great Synagogue," which evidence is at the least very doubtful. In studying the later development of this tradition it will be necessary to bear well in mind how weak is the foundation on which it rests. Writers in later ages, Talmudic and Rabbinical, constructed from this small and shadowy beginning a wonderful edifice that apparently showed strength and power of endurance; but gradually the stones have fallen away and again laid bare the first foundation, and one wonders how an edifice so built could have stood so long. It is interesting to watch its gradual growth and see how stone by stone has been added in succeeding generations, and having seen the building in progress and knowing the foundations on which it has been erected, one is not surprised to find it later crumble and fall away.

Five or six centuries, therefore, after the cessation of prophets in Israel we are told by one only authority that these were succeeded

by the men of the Great Synagogue, who receiving the law of Sinai from their predecessors, delivered it to later generations. The existence of this Synagogue is not definitely connected with the work of Esdras and Nehemias, nor does it appear from the text of the Mishna that the members of that Assembly were concerned with any other part of the sacred text except that in which is embraced the law Joshua received from the hands of Moses.

From the Mishna we may now pass to the Gemara or Rabbinical commentaries to study a further stage in the tradition of the Great Synagogue. This second part of the Talmud dates back to the fourth or fifth century, *i. e.*, at least 200 years after the composition of the Mishna itself. We shall have to quote from the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds; these are but the two sets of explanatory notes and illustrations appended by the rabbis of the different schools to the traditional text of the Jewish "Second Law."

From the Palestinian Talmud,[18] Tract Berakholl (Blessings), we learn that the Great Synagogue numbered 120 members, including more than eighty prophets, and these men, according to Rabbi Jeremias, arranged and put in order the prayer containing the eighteen blessings. Similarly in the Tract Megilla[19] of the Babylonian Talmud we read: "If the 120 elders, and among them many prophets, have arranged the eighteen blessings, why have we learned in another place that Simeon of Peaite had ordered them? They had been forgotten, so he reintroduced them is the answer. But according to Ryle the number of elders is given as eighty-five in the same treatise of the Palestinian Talmud and in the Midrash Ruth. It has already been said that possibly the theory of the Great Synagogue arose from the historical fact of the convocation that met in Jerusalem to hear the law read by Esdras; and very probably the Talmudic traditions of the numbers constituting that Assembly owe their origin to a combination of the lists of names mentioned in chapters 8, 9 and 10 of Nehemias, to which reference has been made. One list gives us eighty-four or eighty-five signatures to the covenant; a second names twenty-six who stood by Esdras at the promulgation of the Torah, and finally there were eight Levites who sang and offered prayer on that occasion. Admitting that these three lists are distinct from one another, we get a total of close on 120.

The later schools of rabbis have given the names of many of the members who constituted the Great Synagogue. But in the Talmud itself, besides the single statement that "Simon the Just" was of the remnants of the Great Synagogue, there is no other direct allusion by name to members of that body.[20]

[18] Schwal. I., 40.
[19] Rodkin, p. 48.
[20] Except we admit the following from "Baylonian Megilla," Rodk., p. 33:

We may now gather from the Talmud some notices of the work done by the members of the Great Synagogue. At first we find various references to Esdras himself and his book. Thus in the Babylonian Tract Sanhedrin we read:[21] "Mar Zutra, according to others Mar Ugba, said: Originally the Torah was given to Israel in Hebrew characters and in the Hebrew language; the second time it was given to Israel in Ezra's time, but in Assyrian characters and in the Aramaic language; finally the Assyrian characters and the Hebrew language were selected for Israel, and the Hebrew characters and the Aramaic language were left to the Acdiolim (Idiots). Who are meant by Idiots? Said R. Hissa: The Samaritans. . . ."[22] A similar passage occurs in the Palestinian Tract Mojilla: "R. Jonathan said there are four beautiful languages appropriate to the usage of the world, to wit: Greek for song, Latin for precise exposition, Syrian (Aramaic) for threnody, Hebrew for ordinary speech. Others join to these Assyrian (square characters) for writing. This last is perfect as written, not when spoken, while Hebrew, though perfect when spoken, leaves much to be desired when written. Thus the Jews in their day chose the square characters for writing, but Hebrew for speech." Two explanations are then given of the name Assyrian as applied to writing; one of these is because the Jews under Esdras brought it with them from Assyria. The words of R. Jose are then quoted, "that Ezra was worthy that the Torah should be given through him if Moses had not preceded him," and that although the Torah was not given through him, the characters of it were changed. Two other statements are made concerning the writing of the sacred texts—one that in the very beginning the Torah was given to Israel in the Assyrian characters, the other that the characters underwent no change at all. These three traditions are all supported by quotations from the Testament itself, and the reader is left to draw his own conclusion.

We shall take one more reference[23] to Esdras. The passage occurs in the Babylonian Talmud Tract Sanhedrin, and is a good specimen of the method of reasoning among the rabbis: "All which is written in the Book of Ezra was said by Nehemias ben Chackhalyah. Why then was it not named after him? Said R.

"And the thing became known to Mordecai." R. Jonathan said Bigthan and Thevesh were Tarsess, and spoke their own language and said among themselves: "Since Esther has come into the court we know no sleep. Therefore, let us put poison into the king's drink in order that he should die." And they knew not that Mordecai was of the great Sanhedrin, every one of whom knew seventy languages. In "Misthna. Schequalim," v. 1., Mardochie (Balsan) is reported to have known seventy languages.

[21] Rodk., 58-59.

[22] Schwal. vi., 212.

[23] Rodk., p. 284.

Nehemias b. Abah: Because he was proud of it. As it reads: "Remember for me, my God for good, all that I have done for this people" (v., 19). But did not David also say similar to this (Ps. lvi., 4): "Remember me, O Lord, when thou favourest thy people?" This was said only as a prayer. R. Joseph said: "The Book was not named after him because he slandered the former governors . . . (v., 15), and in the slander Daniel, who was greater than he, was also included, as he was of the former governors who made their exodus from Babylon a long time before Nehemias. And whence do we know that Daniel was greater than he? From Daniel x., 7: "And I Daniel saw alone this appearance; but the men that were with me did not see the appearance; nevertheless a great terror fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves." Who were these men? Said R. Jeremiah—Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. In one respect he was better than they, because he saw the appearance, but they did not. And in another respect they were better than he, as they were prophets, while he was not. Though they did not see it, their guardian angels did. Said Rabhina: "Infer from this that if a man is shocked unaware of the cause his guardian angel must be aware of it, and his remedy is stepping back four ells or reading the portion of them."

The mention of the three prophets recalls another passage in the same tract (page 24): "The rabbis taught: Since the death of the last prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the Holy Spirit has left Israel; nevertheless, they were still used to a heavenly voice. It happened once that they had a meeting in the attic of the house of Gariah, and a heavenly voice was heard: Among these people there is one worthy that the shekinah should rest upon him; but his generation is not fit. And the sages turned their eyes on Hillel the Elder. And when he departed they lamented him. 'Woe, pious! Woe, modesty! O, thou disciple of Ezra.' "

Our next passage contains a strange piece of exegesis on the words,[24] "And Ezra blessed the Lord, the Great God," and at the same time assigns a reason for the name of the Great Synagogue. It occurs in the Babylonian Tract Gormah.[25] "Great," because he pronounced the express name of God. R. Matter says: "What is written 'the great' means that he said,[26] 'Our God, the great, the mighty, the terrible.' . . . Why is it called the Great Assembly? Because they restored the old crown. What is it? Moses had said (Dt. x., 7): 'The God, the Great, the mighty, the terrible.' Then rose Jeremiah and said: 'The idolaters are destroying his temple.

[24] Nehemias viii., 6.
[25] Rodk., p. 101.
[26] Nehemias ix., 32.

Where is his terribleness?' So he said only 'the great, the mighty, omitting terrible.' Then came Daniel and said: 'The idolaters keep us slaves, His children. Where is His might?' So he omitted 'mighty.' Then came the men of the Great Synagogue and said: 'On the contrary, this is His might that He is patient towards the wicked, and this is His terribleness that if men had not felt His terror, how could such small peoples (as Israel) keep itself among so many peoples of idolaters? Therefore they introduced again the phrase 'the God, the Great, the Terrible, the mighty.' "

It is constantly stated in the Talmud that the men of the Great Synagogue brought again into currency this collocation of epithets which had fallen into disuse. The fact that this exact phrase occurs in the Levites' prayer during the assembly in Jerusalem[27] under Nehemias suggests again the possible source from which may have arisen the traditional story of the Great Synagogue.

We find another reference to the men of the Great Synagogue in the Tract Pesachim. It is therein stated, on the authority of the rabbis, that there are four professions, from the proceeds of which one can never perceive a sign of blessing. These are the scribes, criers, those who earn their money from orphans and, finally, those who traffic at sea. As to the scribes, R. Jehoshua b. Levi said: "Twenty-four days the members of the Great Assembly fasted and prayed that the scribes of scrolls . . . should not become wealthy, for if they did they would not write any more."[28]

Such passages are certainly unsatisfactory, nor do they afford much *historical* evidence for the existence of the Great Synagogue. Yet, together with the quotation which we are about to give from the Babylonian Tract[29] Baba Bathia, they are the chief references to this body to be found in the Talmud. The passage opens with an interesting discussion on the order of the prophets and of the hagiographa, and then continues: "And who wrote all these books? Moses wrote his book and a section of the Bil'am (Numb. xxii.) and Job. Jehoshua wrote his book and the last eight verses of the Pentateuch, beginning, 'And Moses, the servant of the Lord, died.' Samuel wrote his book, Judges and Ruth. David wrote Psalms with the assistance of ten elders, viz., Adam the First, Malachi Zedek, Abraham, Moses, etc. Jeremiah wrote his book, Kings and Lamenta-

---

[27] II. Esdras ix., 32.

[28] Besides fostering the work of copying the Torah, we learn from other tracts that this body of men introduced certain corrections in the text of the Old Testament to prevent misunderstanding (Midrash. Tanchuma, 26 a.), and that they are responsible for the directions concerning the reading of the book of Esther and the keeping of the feast "Purim" (Makkoth. 23. Jeras. Meg. 1).

[29] Rodk., p. 44.

tions. King Hezechiah and his company wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, Songs and Ecclesiastes. The men of the Great Assembly wrote Ezechiel, the Twelve Prophets, Daniel and the Book of Esther. Ezra wrote his book and chronicles the order of all generations down to himself. And who finished Ezra's book? Nehemiah ben. Chakhalyah."

Even to the rabbis themselves this passage presented many difficulties, and hence it is followed by a lengthy debate. As being of present interest we may be allowed to make the following selection (page 46): "One of the rabbis said: 'Job never existed, and he is mentioned in the Scripture only for an example.' Said he (R. Samuel) to him: 'The Scripture is against your theory, as it states plainly (Job i., 1), "There was a man," etc. But according to your theory it is also written (II. Sam. xii., 3), "But the poor man had nothing," etc. Was it so in reality? It was written only for an example. The same may be said concerning Job? If it were so, why then his name and the name of the country he came from?" Different opinions are then given as to the generation in which Job lived, and each opinion is proved from some verse in Scripture. Thus, for example, the proof that Job lived in the days of Ahasuerus is drawn from xlii., 15: "And there were not found such handsome women as the daughters of Job" (page 47), and in which generation were handsome women sought for if not in the generation of Ahasuerus?

This style of argumentation would be sufficient to throw discredit on the whole passage; at least it suggests the attitude of mind in which the rabbis themselves looked upon many statements found in the Talmud. Thus it is difficult to understand how the rabbi who held that Job lived in the time of Ahasuerus could believe that Moses wrote the history of the man of the land of Hus. Nor is it easy to see what assistance David received when engaged in the composition of the Psalms from Adam, Abraham, etc., or at least in what undefined way he was influenced by these patriarchs when he gave form to their words. (Cf. Driver, Introd. to Lit. of O. T., xxxiv. n.)

Among the compositions again of the Great Synagogue we find the writings of Hosea, Amos, Micah and Ezechiel, prophets who lived long before the earliest date that is assigned to the supposed institution of Ezra's Assembly.

We may now pass from the witness of the Talmud to that of later Jewish rabbis, remembering that we are watching the gradual growth of a tradition built upon a single Mishnic text of the second century A. D. We shall find the connection between Esdras and the Great Synagogue becoming more marked and the field of their labors much extended. As early as the tenth century the names of the members

of that body are mentioned, and these can be identified with the list of names given in the Book of Esdras, another proof, if further proof were needed, that this tradition has arisen from an interpretation of the events recorded in those chapters. Thus the Targum of "Song of Songs" speaks of "Ezra the priest and Zerabbabel and Jeshua and Nehemiah and Mordecai and Belsan, the men of the Great Synagogue, who are likened to roses that they may have strength to labour in the law day and night" (vii., 1-2). Other authorities add to this list Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, also Daniel, Mishael and Azariah. One author makes the list up to twelve and says that these went up from Babylon to Jerusalem at the beginning of the age of the second temple, and that others were added from among the leading men of Israel to make up the total to 120. In these rabbinical writings there is hopeless confusion in chronology. Zorobabel came up from Babylon in 536 and was not followed by Esdras till 458, yet the Great Synagogue founded by Esdras, according to tradition, numbers among its members Zorobabel and men who had come up with him from captivity eighty years previously, and one of the remnants of this Assembly was Simon the Just, who lived in the time of Alexander the Great. That these men should have been contemporaneous is just possible on the Talmudic computation, according to which Alexander occupied the throne in the generation after the return from exile; but historical evidence forces us to place the career of Alexander two centuries after that event and one century after the mission of Esdras.

According to the rabbis these wise men established good laws for the right government of the people. They "restored the law to its former condition," for they collected the Scriptures, which had been scattered at the first captivity, and by careful study and scrutiny of the MSS. established a text free from doubtful passages, and finally they divided the Scriptures into three divisions, the Law, the Prophets and the Hagiographa.[30]

Though many references to the Great Synagogue and its supposed functions may be found in the writings of the rabbis who lived between the age of the Talmud and the sixteenth century, the first really important work was not published till 1538. In that year Elias Levita edited his commentary on the Massorah, in which he defended the tradition of the men of the Great Synagogue, and advanced that tradition along a line that attracted the attention of the scholars of the Reformation. According to Elias, Esdras, with the assistance of the men of the Great Synagogue, promulgated the

[30] With wonderful facility do these Jewish scholars fall back on the authority of the Great Synagogue, tracing to them anything ancient, the exact origin of which had been lost in a remote antiquity.

correct consonantal text, and at the same time formed the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is well to note that according to this book the whole period of the Great Synagogue did not exceed forty years. The reputation of Levita as a scholar obtained for his theory ready acceptance among Protestant divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But a still more exhaustive treatise appeared from the Basle press in 1620 entitled "Tiberias S. Commentarius Masorethism," by John Buxtorf, containing all that was then known from Jewish tradition concerning the Massorah. Buxtorf endorses the theory of Elias concerning the canon of the Scriptures that Ezra and the men of the Great Synagogue defined the limits of the Mosaic prophetical and other books that were written by special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He also strives to prove against Elias that the principal source of the Massorah was the same body of men. "Authores ejus (*i. e.*, Massora) Massoretha vocantur quos Hebrai communiter viros Synagoga Magna esse volunt."

The theory of Elias Levita and Buxtorf that Esdras and the men of the Great Synagogue established the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures is a distinct advance on the early tradition, and a very important one. That Divine inspiration and prophecy *de facto* came to an end among the chosen people some time after the return from the exile seems to have been the common belief among the Jews. Yet previous to the sixteenth century we do not find any writer stating that the Hebrew canon was closed by an authoritative act of the Great Synagogue. Josephus, it is true, maintains in his work against Apion that from the days of Artaxerxes the exact succession of the prophets had ceased in Israel; and in the Babylonian Tract Sanhedrin we learn on the authority of the rabbis that since the days of the last Prophets Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi the Holy Spirit has left Israel. But it was reserved for later writers to assign the closing of the Scripture canon to the first generation after the return from Babylon.

No further advance has been made in the tradition of the Great Synagogue since the publication of the "Tiberias," and subsequent supporters of the theory have been engaged in defending it against the attacks of adversaries. As early as the seventeenth century there were gifted scholars—as Alting (1618-1697) and Burmann (1632-1679)—who began to question Jewish tradition and were unwilling to admit the existence of the men of the Great Synagogue. At the beginning of the next century (1727) Rau published at Utrecht his "Diatribe de Synagoga Magna." Though written under the influence of strong prejudice against the authority of Jewish scholars, this work gives a full account of the tradition of the Great Synagogue and shows how devoid it is of any substantial foundation.

In more recent times Ruemen's historical investigation of the tradition has considerably weakened it, so that its supporters, in order to meet the attacks of criticism, have been forced to change in some important points the traditional story. Being unwilling to reject the Mishnic testimony, according to which Simeon the Just was of the remnants of the Great Assembly, men like Ginsbury, in his edition of Levita's work (1867), and Westcott (Bible in the Church) have departed from the old Jewish chronology and assigned to the Great Synagogue a much longer existence than is justified by the evidence at our disposal. At present, therefore, the weight of authority based on historical evidence seems to be entirely against the existence of the Great Synagogue.

In conclusion, therefore, we may ask ourselves, was the Great Synagogue a religious body instituted by Esdras to establish again Jewish worship and to last for a generation only, or was it a permanent body? The first hypothesis is in keeping with the Talmudic writings and the rabbinical tradition up to the seventeenth century, but is untenable because, among other reasons, it supposes that one of its members was Simeon the Just, a contemporary of Alexander the Great. The second hypothesis is equally untrustworthy, for the supposition that the Great Synagogue was a distinct religious body, playing an important part in Jewish history during the 200 years subsequent to Esdras, is a departure from the traditional story and is unsupported by any historical evidence.

The convocation under Nehemias, called together to pray, to confess their sins, to fast, to hear read the Torah, might fitly be called a Synagogue-Keneseth—an assembly met for worship—and a Great Synagogue indeed, as it was epoch-making in the religious life of the Jews. But such a Great Synagogue met once for all, and its history is told in chapters 8, 9 and 10 of the second canonical Book of Esdras.

Joseph Bullen, S. J.

Chesterfield, England.

PIUS VI. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

V.

THE French Republicans who had seized Rome and their Roman adherents whom they had installed as nominal rulers of the city had not been restrained by any feelings of veneration or compassion from driving Pius VI. into exile, but they seem to have dreaded the odium which they would have incurred had his death been the result of their brutality, and the aged Pontiff was allowed to bring his first day's journey to a close at the village of Monterosi, about twenty-six miles from Rome.[1] The greater part of his escort of dragoons had been withdrawn on reaching the French camp beyond Ponte Molle; the remainder left him at La Horta, the first post station, after insisting on being paid for their services, and the two majors continued to accompany him to the end of his journey. Pius VI. was then in his 81st year. He had barely recovered from a long and dangerous illness, and such was his state of exhaustion on reaching the Benedictine Abbey of Monterosi that he had to be lifted out of his carriage by his attendants and carried to his apartments. He was able, however, to continue his journey on the following day, in spite of the inclemency of the weather, and traveled to Tuscany by easy stages, stopping at Viterbo, where he prayed at the shrine of Santa Rosa, whose body is still preserved intact in the convent of the Franciscan nuns at San Lorenzo Nuovo, Radicofani and San Guirico.[2]

At many places along the road followed by the Holy Father the peasantry assembled from the neighboring villages to receive his blessing, and in the towns where he stopped the crowds were so great that his carriage could hardly make its way through them; but on arriving at the Tuscan frontier no representative of the Grand Duke came to welcome him. Ferdinand III. and his Ministers, who

[1] Mgr. Pietro Baldassari: "Relazione delle avversita e patimenti del glorioso Papa Pio VI. negli ultimi tre anni del suo Pontifacto." Roma, 1889. Mgr. Baldassari was secretary to Mgr. Innico Diego Caracciolo, the Maestro di Camera to Pius VI. Though he did not accompany the Holy Father when he was carried away from Rome, he rejoined him when he was living at the Carthusian monastery near Florence, and was able to obtain a minute account of his journey.

[2] Sciout (Ludovic) Le Directoire, Paris, 1897, Vol. M, p. 330. The Directors had at first intended to send Pius VI. to Portugal, and on the 1st Ventose (19th February, 1798) had sent General Berthier a decree to that effect. They then changed their minds, and by a decree of the 8th Ventose (26th February) they ordered him to send the Holy Father to Brazil on board of one of the frigates at Incona or Civita Vecchia. But the Pope was already in Tuscany.

knew how powerless they were to offer any resistance to the armies of the republic, were much embarrassed on learning that it was the intention of the Directory to send Pius VI. into Tuscany, as they feared that a snare was being laid for them, and that any manifestation of sympathy with the misfortunes of the Holy Father might afford the French Republicans a pretext for invading their country. The government had therefore decided that the Pope should not be allowed to live in Florence, and Mgr. Zondadari, the Archbishop of Sienna, was requested to prepare lodgings for the Papal Court in some monastery in that town. Notice was also given to the Bishops, to the heads of religious orders and to the police that, as the Grand Duke believed that the Pope was traveling merely as a private person, he forbade any public demonstration in his honor, such as the ringing of bells, ceremonious receptions or even the applause of the people.[3]

Pius VI. arrived at Sienna on February 25, which was the first Sunday in Lent, and though great crowds had assembled to greet him, no acclamations were allowed, all signs of rejoicing were sternly suppressed and the people could only show their veneration for the Holy Father by kneeling in silence to receive his blessing. The Augustinian monastery at Sienna had been chosen as the residence of Pius VI., who was received on his arrival by Mgr. Odescalchi, his Nuncio at Florence, and a few days later the Marchese Manfredini, one of the Ministers of Ferdinand III., came to compliment him on the part of his sovereign and to request him to take up his abode at Sienna rather than at Florence. The Holy Father willingly consented, but as many prelates and persons of high rank, both French and Italian, known to be hostile to the republic, came to reside in Sienna, the anxiety of the Tuscan Ministry to avoid giving any offense to the Directory was such that Lieutenant General Martini, the Governor of Sienna, received orders in the beginning of May not to allow any persons who had formed part of the Papal Court in Rome, with the exception of those actually in attendance on the Holy Father, to remain in the town for more than forty-eight hours, or, in very exceptional cases, three days at the utmost. Few even of the Cardinals who passed through Sienna were allowed to stay so long, and every obstacle was placed in the way of the Bishops of Tuscany to prevent them from coming to do homage to the Head of the Church.

Before the French troops entered Rome some of the Cardinals who, on account of their official connection with the Papal Govern-

[3] Count A. F. D'Allonville, "Memoires tires des papiers d'un Homme d'Etat sur les causes secretes qui ont determine la politique des Cabinets dans les guerres de la Revolution," Paris, 1831-1837, Vol. V., p. 251.

ment or their well-known hostility to France, had reason to dread the vengeance of the republic, had taken the precaution of seeking a refuge in the kingdom of Naples; others fled to Tuscany soon after the departure of Pius VI. Of the thirteen who still remained in Rome, six were arrested on March 8 and imprisoned in the Convent of the Convertile, together with the Governors of Rome and Perugia and some other prelates; the others were ordered to leave Rome and to return to their native cities. Two Cardinals, unfortunately—Tommaso Antici and Vincenzo Marias degli Altieri—when threatened by the consuls of the new republic, first with imprisonment and then with deportation unless they renounced the dignity of Cardinal, yielded to these menaces, and said to the Holy Father that their great age and their infirmities rendered it impossible for them to fulfill any longer the duties attached to their position or to uphold it becomingly, and they therefore requested him to accept their resignation. Pius VI. was deeply affected by this cowardly act, and in the hope that the erring Cardinals might repent and revoke this abdication of their rank, he deferred taking any decision in the matter until the month of September, when, finding that they still persisted in their determination, he accepted their resignation and declared them to be no longer members of the Sacred College.[4]

The six Cardinals who had been imprisoned in the Convent of the Convertile were sent after a few days to the Dominican manastery at Civita Vecchia, and it was suggested to them also that they should lay down the dignity of Cardinal, but they rejected the proposal with indignation, and even refused to purchase their liberty with money, as they considered that it would be dishonorable to make such a concession to those who had arrested them so unjustly. They were soon joined by Cardinal Archetti, Bishop of Ascoli, and by the prelates who had been Governors of Frosinone, Loreto, Ascoli and Spoleto, and their imprisonment lasted until the end of March, when they were ordered to leave the territory of the republic and were obliged to embark in very stormy weather for Leghorn, from where they retired to various parts of Italy.

The banishment of the Sovereign Pontiff, the dispersion of the

[4] Baldassari, p. 45. Cardinal Altieri died on February 10, 1800, aged seventy-five. He had deeply repented the weakness of which he had been guilty, and when dying he wrote to the Cardinal Dean of the Sacred College, asking him to obtain for him the forgiveness of the Pope who should be elected in the conclave then being held. In renouncing the dignity of Cardinal he had acted by the advice of a theologian who held Jansenist opinions. Cardinal Antici passed the rest of his life in retirement at Recanati. At the time of the conclave in 1800 he sought to be readmitted into the Sacred College, but his demand was rejected, and he died in 1812, after having written to Pius VII., who was then imprisoned in Savona, to express his repentance and ask pardon for his fault. *Ibid*, p. 57.

Cardinals and the consequent disorganization of the congregations for the administration of ecclesiastical affairs over which they presided was apparently considered by the French Directory as presenting a favorable opportunity for inflicting further injury on religion by the creation of an anti-Pope and of a schismatical church, which, like that which had been founded in France, might furnish a convenient pretext for further confiscations and proscriptions. The candidate selected for the purpose by the French authorities in Rome was Mgr. Emmanuel di Gregorio, of the family of the Marquises of Squillace, the civil vicegerent of the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, a prelate distinguished by his learning and whose kindness and affability had rendered him very popular in that city. He was privately informed that it was the intention of Generals Vial and Dallemagne, who commanded the French garrison, to name him Patriarch of the West and Pope, and on his objecting that the Sovereign Pontiff was still alive, he was informed that Pius VI. would be persuaded or forced to resign, and that as the Cardinals were absent from Rome, the election would be made by the parochial clergy and the people. Mgr. di Gregorio was astounded at this proposal, and fearing to excite the anger of the Republicans by refusing to act the part of an anti-Pope, he fled from Rome and rejoining Pius VI. at Sienna, revealed to him this conspiracy which threatened the unity of the Church. It was not, however, carried any further, for the French and Italian revolutionists were confronted with more difficult problems which demanded an immediate solution, namely, the extortion of more money from a country which had already paid such heavy contributions, and the suppression of the insurrections which had been excited in many parts of the Papal States by the insults offered to religion, the spoliation of the churches and the taxes levied by the newly created republican authorities for the celebration of patriotic feasts in honor of government.[5]

The rising of the inhabitants of the villages near Rome, so easily put down by Murat, was followed in April and May, 1798, by a far more serious revolt in the mountainous region near the Lake of Trasimen. From Castel Rigone, where it began, the movement was spread rapidly throughout the district by bands of from 400 to 800 armed peasants carrying the Papal flag, who pulled down

[5] "Memoires du General Baron Thiebault," Paris, 1894, Vol. II., p. 204: "L'insurrection du Trasimene eut les memes causes que toutes les insurrections qui l'avarent precedee; la composition des nouvelles autorites; le choise de agents tres mal fames les contributions forcees des villes pour des fetes dites patriotiques: les requisitions pour ainsi dire incommes des sujets du Pape; les vexations et concussions des percepteurs . . . la loi qui defandait aux religieux de queter et aux pretres de faire des aumones."

the trees of liberty, and at last concentrating their forces, seized Citta di Castello, where they massacred the French garrison and the republican municipality. A strong French column which attacked the town was repulsed with loss, but when it returned to the assault with artillery, the insurgents left the town during the night and the inhabitants surrendered. What remained of the bands was soon scattered and the country was apparently pacified, but the commissioners who represented the Directory in Rome, instead of acknowledging that the rapacity of their agents had driven the people to take up arms and adopting measures to put a stop to their dishonesty, preferred to throw the blame on the clergy, and especially on the Holy Father. They wrote, therefore, to the Grand Duke of Tuscany asserting that the signal of revolt had been given from Sienna; that the agitators had received their instructions from Pius VI. and from those about him; that these facts showed the necessity of removing the Pope from the neighborhood of the frontier, and they requested His Serene Highness to send him to Leghorn, where they would provide a vessel which should bring him to Cagliari. The commissioners probably hoped that in the feeble condition of the Pope's health the sea voyage to Sardinia might prove fatal to him; but Ferdinand III., though careful to avoid whatever might irritate the republic, refused to yield to this insolent demand. He sent Marquis Manfredini to Rome furnished with medical certificates to prove that to send the Holy Father to Sardinia would endanger his life, and at the same time to remind General Gouvion de St. Cyr and the commissioners of the precautions which he had taken to isolate Pius VI. and to remove from Sienna the prelates who had been in the service of the Holy See; but he was only able to obtain as a favor that the Pope should be allowed to reside at the Certosa di Val d'Ema, a Carthusian monastery about two miles from Florence, which he should be ready to leave for some other place whenever the Directory might judge fit.

This uncertainty as to his future movements, and the fear that at some future period he might be deprived of all communication with the faithful, caused Pius VI. before leaving Sienna to send to Cardinal Albani, the Dean of the Sacred College, who, together with the greater number of the Cardinals, had taken refuge at Naples, the bull "Christi Ecclesia," which he had signed on December 30 of the preceding year, and by which he had authorized the election of his successor, to be held wherever the majority of the Cardinals should judge most convenient and without observing the delay of ten days which should elapse between the death of a Pope and the opening of the conclave.

In obedience to the will of the French Commander-in-Chief, the

Grand Duke issued the order for the departure of the Holy Father on May 26, and on the same day a violent earthquake took place in Sienna by which the Augustinian convent was much damaged, and the Pope, who narrowly escaped with his life, was obliged to take refuge in a villa outside the town. He left for Florence on June 1. Crowds of people had assembled along the road from Sienna to Florence to see him pass and ask his blessing, but between Florence and the Carthusian monastery patrols had been placed to prevent any demonstration or concourse of spectators, and such was the Grand Duke's anxiety to avoid whatever might displease the Directory, that when he had paid one ceremonious visit to the Sovereign Pontiff shortly after his arrival, he had no other interview with him during his stay of nearly ten months at the monastery. It was a period of almost absolute seclusion for the Holy Father, who while at Sienna had been allowed to receive visitors and give audiences every day, but at the Carthusian monastery this liberty was denied him. Neither the inhabitants of Florence nor strangers passing through were allowed to visit him, and the French Ambassador Reinhard, who caused him to be narrowly watched, denounced to the Grand Duke the persons suspected of wishing to see him and requested him to expel them from the city. Before long the Holy Father's health became still more enfeebled; he was unable even to stand without the assistance of two persons, and was obliged to cease from the celebration of Mass.

The Emperor of Austria and the King of Spain, at the request of the Nuncios at Vienna and Madrid, had vainly endeavored to persuade the French Government to allow Pius VI. to remain at the Carthusian monastery, but finding that the Directors were resolved to expel him from Italy, they expressed their desire to receive him in their States. The King of Spain proposed to convey him to one of the Balearic Islands, but the Holy Father could not accept this offer. The Emperor demanded that he should be allowed to reside in the Venetian territory recently added to Austria, and he also invited the Cardinals to take up their abode there, promising them that in case of the Pope's death he would assure the liberty of the conclave for the election of his successor. Pius VI. advised the Cardinals to accept this offer, and those who were living in various towns of Northern Italy went to Venice, where those who had taken refuge at Naples followed them when King Ferdinand left his capital and fled to Palermo on the advance of the French army. The demand for the expulsion of the Holy Father from Tuscany and his exile to Sardinia was again renewed by Reinhard in the month of July, while Manfredini suggested, on the other hand, that the Convent of Melk, in Austria, would be a more suitable place of

residence; for, besides the danger which might result to the Pope's health from a journey by sea, he would also run the risk of being captured by an English cruiser or an Algerine corsair, and the matter was again referred to the Directory for their consideration. The Grand Duke, indeed, had made every effort to please the French Government; he had expelled the French emigrants; he had recognized the Cisalpine Republic, though its emissaries were seeking to revolutionize Tuscany; he had also been obliged, in spite of his protestations, to grant at least a partial recognition to the Roman Republic by taking down the Papal arms from the Nuncio's palace; but he saw that the Directors aimed at causing the death of the Holy Father without rendering themselves directly responsible for it, and he steadfastly refused to allow himself to be made a tool for the execution of their odious intrigues.

The derogations which Pius VI. had made by the bull "Christi Ecclesia" to the laws regulating the election of a Sovereign Pontiff did not seem to many of the Cardinals sufficient to provide against all interference with the liberty of the conclave or the danger of the election of more than one Pope by isolated groups of Cardinals. Yielding therefore to their request, the Holy Father by the bull of November 13, 1798, "Quum nos, superiori anno," granted a still further relaxation of the laws and constitutions of his predecessors and decreed that if all the Cardinals were not able to come together, those who were in greatest number in the States of a Catholic monarch were alone to exercise the right of election. They were also allowed to make preparations for the conclave during his lifetime, but they were not to discuss the choice of a candidate. Two-thirds of the votes of the Cardinals present would suffice for a valid election. The bull was sent to the senior of the Cardinals residing in the Venetian provinces in the beginning of March, 1799, but on the death of Pius VI., as the exceptional case to be guarded against did not occur, it was not necessary to have recourse to it.

The Directory continued to aim at the conversion of the Italian States into vassal republics humbly devoted to the interests of France. It still pretended, indeed, to recognize the independence of the King of Piedmont, but it encouraged invasions of his territory by armed bands from the adjacent Cisalpine and Ligurian Commonwealths for the purpose of exciting his subjects to revolt; but Charles Emmanuel appealed to his people, who rallied round him and crushed the insurgents. When the Directors found that all attempts to excite a revolution in Piedmont were of no avail, they imposed on the King a new treaty, by which a French garrison was to occupy the citadel of Turin for the space of two months, and they promised in return to guarantee the tranquillity of his kingdom

and not to assist directly or indirectly those who sought to overthrow his government.

It was only the dread that the Directory might side openly with the revolutionary party, which by itself was unable to overcome the loyalty of his troops, and the hope that Austria would soon declare war again that could have induced Charles Emmanuel to make such concessions. They did not, however, satisfy the Directors; they sought to extort from the King by threats several millions for the support of their army. The French troops continued to hold the citadel of Turin long after the expiration of the prescribed time, and when at last the King's downfall had been decided, a demand was made for the contingent of 9,000 men which had been agreed on by the previous treaty. As the King could not comply at once with the request, Eymar, the French envoy at Turin, withdrew to the citadel as though his life were threatened, while the French troops in the Cisalpine Republic, crossing the frontier by night, surprised and disarmed the garrisons of several towns (15 Frimaire an VII.—5th December, 1798). At the same time General Joubert, the French Commander-in-Chief at Milan, published an order of the day in which he accused the Piedmontese Court of plotting against France and shedding the blood of French and Piedmontese republicans and declaring that his army, which was about to invade Piedmont, would respect property and religion and assure the peace and happiness of the country. General Grouchy, who commanded the citadel of Turin, then, by gaining over some of the advisers of Charles Emmanuel, persuaded the King to abdicate, though without making any formal proposals to him, so that it might seem that the act was voluntary;[6] and on the night of the 9th December, 1798, the royal family left Turin for the Island of Sardinia, the only possession which was left to them. On the following day a pro-

[6] "Le Marquis de Costa de Beauregard, un Homme d'Autrefois," Paris, 1877, p. 435. After the hasty retreat of the French on the approach of the Austro-Russian forces, a copy of General Grouchy's secret report to the Directory on the abdication of Charles Emmanuel IV. was found, in which he described the perfidious mode whereby, without binding himself by any engagement, and although war had not been declared, he persuaded him to abdicate. "Le moment etait venu de faire jouer tous les ressorts secrets que j'avais prepares, je les mis en mouvement, et trentat un envoye du roi m'arriva c'etait l'avocat (name omitted) homme a gagner, et il le fut. D'autres personnes l'etaient egalement; mais la grande difficulte etait que les propositions emanassent du Roi; qu'il fit ce qu'on voulait, et que sa volonte seule le lui fit faire sans que rien d'ecrit ne Vienne de moi; afin que dans tous les cas je puisse etre desavoue. Cette conduite etait d'autant plus necessaire que la guerre n'etait pas declaree au Roi de Sardaigne, qu'on ignorait le parti que seraient forces de prendre le Directoire et le corps Legislatif, et qu'il fallait agir de telles manieres que l'acte du Roi paraissant voluntaire ne put amenter l'Europe entiere contre la Republique Francaise et faire rompre le Congress de Rastadt."

visional government was established in Turin. The French republican calendar was imposed on the Piedmontese people; many of the principal nobles were sent as hostages to France; a war tax of two millions of francs was levied on the country, and on February 8, 1799, the annexation to France was voted by the provisional government.

The overthrow of the King of Sardinia was followed in a few months by that of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, from whom Reinhard, the French Ambassador, continued by order of the Directory to demand the deportation of Pius VI. to Sardinia. The temporary occupation of Leghorn by an Anglo-Neopolitan force on November 28, 1798, when the King of Naples was marching upon Rome, and the seizure there of some French privateers, was made the pretext for demanding an indemnity of 2,500,000 francs, of which half was paid, although the Grand Duke had remained neutral and was in no way responsible for the invasion of the port. The arrival, too, of the King of Piedmont in Florence (January 18, 1799) while on his way to Sardinia under the escort of an adjutant-general named Chipault, was taken advantage of by the Directors to make fresh efforts to induce the Holy Father to accompany him to that island, and thus cast on Charles Emmanuel instead of on the Grand Duke the responsibility for the fatal consequences which might ensue. But Pius VI. was then dangerously ill of fever; his limbs were covered with sores; the doctors had lost all hope of saving his life, and he had received the last sacraments. When, therefore, at the end of January, 1799, Adjutant-general Chipault came to visit the Holy Father with orders from the Directory that he should embark for Sardinia along with the royal family, he was so much shocked and affected on finding that he presented more the appearance of a corpse than that of a living being, that he did not venture to carry out his instructions, but merely said that the King of Piedmont, being about to leave, invited the Holy Father to accompany him, to which the Pope replied that it was impossible for him to comply with the request. The King sailed, therefore, for Sardinia, and on March 10 Chipault was again commanded by the Directory to make every effort to oblige Pius VI. to leave Italy, and it was only by the production of a protest written by the Holy Father, accompanied by medical certificates which proved that it was absolutely impossible for him to undertake the journey, that he was induced to desist.

Before the certificates had been placed before the Directors the Grand Duke was warned by a despatch from his representatives in Paris that if he wished to preserve his States and ensure the tranquility and welfare of his subjects, he should at once insist that

Pius VI. should leave for Sardinia. Ferdinand III., who fully understood the hopelessness of his position, yielded at last to these repeated threats. He assured Mgr. Odescalchi, the Papal Nuncio, that nothing should ever induce him to constrain the Sovereign Pontiff to leave his States, but that he hoped that Pius VI. would consider how impossible it was for him to withstand the power of France, and that in case of an invasion, Tuscany would be overwhelmed with the same misfortunes which had befallen the rest of Italy. He therefore requested the Holy Father to take whatever steps he might judge advisable and promised to respect his decision.

Pius VI. received this intelligence calmly and fearlessly. He declared that he was prepared to undergo any suffering in obedience to the will of God, and that he would not allow his dread of undertaking a journey to Sardinia to serve as a pretext to the Directory for invading Tuscany. Preparations were therefore made for the departure of the Holy Father, but on the following day Reinhard suddenly informed the Grand Duke that the Pope was to remain at the Certosa.

Neither the contributions which had been exacted from the Grand Duke nor whatever concessions he might be induced to make with regard to Pius VI. could avail to preserve him from sharing the fate of the other Italian sovereigns, and when the Directors thought that their interests demanded that Tuscany should adopt republican institutions they accused Ferdinand III. of conspiring with Austria and Naples against the French republic and of having consented to the occupation of Leghorn by the Anglo-Neopolitan expedition. The legislative councils in Paris, therefore, declared war against both Austria and Tuscany on March 12, 1799, and though when the news was received in Florence, Manfredini was despatched to Mantua to treat with General Scherer, the Commander-in-Chief of the French army in Italy, and offer whatever terms might be necessary to obtain peace, and though Reinhard assured that he had received no information on the subject, the French troops in the province of Bologna crossed the frontier on the 24th under the command of General Gauthier and entered Florence on the 25th, while another detachment coming from Lucca took possession of Leghorn and seized all the merchandise belonging to the English, the Russians and the Portugese. The Grand Duke and the members of his family were allowed to leave Florence for Vienna, and when a few days later General Scherer received orders from Paris to arrest and bring them as prisoners to Briancon, they were happily beyond his reach. The occupation of Tuscany by the French was followed by the grotesque ceremony of planting "trees of liberty" in the various towns, as was customary on the proclamation of a

republic. The Tuscan troops were disarmed and sent to the Genoese territory; a provisional government was installed in Florence under the guidance of Reinhard and the usual band of French agents and commissioners who accompanied the French armies plundered the palace of the Grand Duke of all its treasures.

On the day following the arrival of the French troops a detachment of sixty men was sent to guard the Certosa, and next day Pius VI. was informed by a French general that it had been decided that he was to leave that night for Parma, to which he merely replied: "For Parma? Very well," and though the prelates who accompanied the Holy Father and the representatives of Spain made every effort to obtain from General Gauthier a delay of twenty-four hours, his departure was fixed at 2 o'clock on the next morning (28th March) in order that he might pass through the streets of Florence before dawn. Such was the helplessness of Pius VI., the lower part of whose body was paralyzed, that he required to be lifted by four servants into the carriage in which he was to travel, and the effort caused him so much suffering that some of the troopers who formed his escort were affected to tears.

The Directory had already decided that Pius VI. was to be imprisoned at Briancon, a fortified town in the department of *des Hautes-Alpes,* but that fact had not as yet been made known to him, and he had been allowed to believe that his ultimate destination was to be Parma. Before, however, entering on the description of the long and painful wanderings in which Pius VI. was mercilessly forced to pass the last year of his life, it will be necessary to follow the progress of the armies of revolution, as under pretense of inaugurating an era of liberty, equality and universal prosperity, they spread bloodshed and desolation throughout the southern provinces of Italy.

The Neopolitan army of nearly 40,000 men which had invaded the Papal States had been hastily raised. It was largely composed of untrained recruits and its officers belonged to the aristocracy, among which the Masonic lodges had been allowed to diffuse the principles of the revolution almost without hindrance. It had been beaten at all points by Championnet's troops, which did not reckon more than 15,000 or 16,000 men, forced to evacuate Rome and retreat hastily across the frontier. The French followed it in several columns, committing the same error as that of which Mack had been guilty, but without paying the same penalty. General Duhesme, marching along the shores of the Adriatic, seized the important fortresses of Civitella del Fronto and Pescara, both strongly fortified and garrisoned, without meeting with any serious resistance, and on the coast of the Mediterranean the town of Gaeta, generally considered

to be impregnable, was surrendered to General Rey after a few shells had been thrown into it.[7]

General MacDonald alone was checked in his advance by a retrenched camp under the walls of Coyma, where the defeated Neapolitan army had been rallied. The King, who was warned on December 18 by General Mack that he despaired of offering any serious opposition to the progress of the French, had already issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of the Abruzzi, calling on them to take up arms for the defense of their religion, their King and their homes, and reminding them of the bravery with which their ancestors had fought to place the crown of Naples on the head of his father. Though this appeal met with an immediate response, and though the *lazzaroni* or populace of the capital asked for arms to defend the King and attacked those whom they suspected of holding revolutionary opinions, Ferdinand IV. felt that his position at Naples was untenable. The nobles about him urged him to come to terms with the French, but the fate of the King of Sardinia deterred him from accepting their advice. His army was disorganized and the majority of its officers had shown themselves to be traitors or cowards. The fleet could not be manned, as the greater part of the sailors refused to serve, though offered double pay,[8] and the turbulent *lazzaroni* inspired but little confidence, for their manifestations of loyalty took the form of pillage and assassination. The King decided, therefore, to take refuge in Sicily, where he

[7] The fortress of Civitella del Pronto stands upon a steep rock which commands the surrounding country; the town at its foot is defended by strong walls washed by a deep torrent. Its works were in good condition and armed with twelve guns. Its garrison of one hundred men was sufficient for its defense. It surrendered after an attack of a few hours. "Thiebault," II., p. 296.

Pescara was strongly fortified. It had eighty guns, was well provided with stores and had a garrison of two thousand men, while General Duhesme had only four small field pieces, yet it surrendered after a few hours' fire. *Ibid*, p. 307.

Gaeta was generally looked upon as an impregnable fortress. It had seventy heavy guns, twelve mortars, twenty thousand muskets, a garrison of three thousand men and provisions for a year; but its commander, Marshall Tachudy, a Swiss officer, surrendered it when General Rey had sent a few shells into it from a howitzer. *Ibid*, p. 340.

[8] Freiherr von Helfert. Fabrizio Ruffo. Revolution und Gegan—Revolution von Neapel, November, 1798, bis August, 1799. Wien, 1882, p. 517. Letter from Queen Caroline to the Emperor of Austria, 21st December, 1798: "Nous sommes completement malheureux, les fuyards arrivent en grand nombre, toute la ville est decouragee, le peuple crie, hurle, se rassemble, mais dit vouloir saccager punir les Jacobins internes, non chatier, les combattre, c'est a dire il voudrait saccager avant la venue des Francais et ceci est une populace tres nombreuse . . . la noblesse ne fait rien que blamer tout ce que fait le Gouvernment; le militaire et la marine est douteuse, . . . il faut tenir avec le canon les matelots a bord, car tous veulent s'enfuir."

might form another army with which to reconquer his States, and on the night of December 21 he left the palace by a secret passage, together with the royal family, and embarked on Nelson's flagship, the Vanguard. They carried with them over £2,000,000, the crown jewels and the most precious works of art from the royal palaces and the museums, which would otherwise have fallen into the hands of the French. On the following day a deputation of all classes of citizens, headed by the Archbishop of Naples, came to implore of the King to remain in his capital, but he refused and sailed on the 23d for Palermo, accompanied by two vessels of his fleet, the crews of which had remained faithful, after naming Prince Francesco Pignatelli-Strongoli vicar general of the kingdom and General Mack captain general of the army.

Before the French columns which had marched along the Adriatic and through the central provinces could rejoin General Championnet at Capua they had to fight their way through the Abruzzi, where the mass of the population had risen, and though badly armed and without organization, were opposing the invaders with an undaunted courage which offered a splendid contrast to the feeble resistance made by the regular army. At Aquila every house had to be taken at the point of the bayonet; at Pepoli nearly all the inhabitants were massacred; at Isernia, where the churches, the convents, the houses were loopholed and changed into so many fortresses, no quarter was given, and all those taken in arms were shot, to the number of 1,500. If General Mack had taken advantage of this rising and coöperated with it, Championnet, whose communications with Rome had been intercepted, would have been obliged to surrender; but Mack had lost all confidence in his army, for a revolutionary committee formed in Naples and comprising many members of the aristocracy had gained over some of his superior officers. He and Prince Pignatelli decided, therefore, on demanding an armistice for the purpose of concluding a peace, and the Prince di Migliano and the Duke di Gesso were sent to treat with Championnet. The French general was hemmed in on all sides; the mountaineers had taken Itri, Fondi and San Germano; they had blown up a park of artillery, and his troops were almost without provisions or cartridges, but he refused at first to treat unless Naples were surrendered. The envoys came back next day and were again dismissed; it was only on their third visit to the French advanced posts at Sparanisi that Championnet, who had just learned that General Duhesme was within two days' march, consented to grant a truce to an army which, were it properly led, had it in its power to make him surrender unconditionally. By the terms of this armistice, which was to last two months and was signed on January 12, 1799, Capua was to be sur-

rendered, the Neopolitan troops were to be withdrawn behind a line passing across Italy from the mouth of the Lagni on the Mediterranean to that of the Ofanto on the Adriatic, thus abandoning a third of the kingdom to the French; the seaports were to be declared neutral, and the King was to pay to the republic ten millions of *livres tournois* (about $2,000,000). The French entered Capua on the 14th, and Championnet fixed his headquarters in the palace of Caserta, where a committee of Neapolitan revolutionists, presided over by the unfrocked monk Bassal, who had organized the Roman revolution and whom the Directory had just dismissed from his post of secretary to the Roman Consuls, maintained an active correspondence with the disaffected in the capital. But when the French Commissioner Archamba appeared at Naples to receive the first instalment of the war tax, the *lazzaroni,* considering themselves betrayed, rose to the cry of "Death to the French!" They disarmed and expelled the troops which had just returned from the expedition to Leghorn; they seized the four castles which commanded the city without resistance from their garrisons, threw open the prisons, set free the galley slaves and proceeded to massacre the persons whom they suspected of being Jacobins. Representatives elected by the people then chose as their leader the Prince of Moliterno, a distinguished cavalry officer, in whom they had much confidence, but who had been secretly gained over to the cause of the revolution. He succeeded in appeasing the people and restoring order and placed the four castles under the command of members of the aristocracy. Prince Pignatelli was then requested to leave, and he set sail for Palermo, where the King caused him to be arrested and imprisoned in the castle of Girgenti, while Mack fled to Championnet's camp, surrendered to him and was allowed to return to Vienna.

It was only a minority of Neapolitan revolutionists which wished to introduce the French army and French institutions into the kingdom; the majority hoped to repel them and to found an independent State based on democratic principles, while the populace had but one idea—to fight against the Jacobins for their religion and their King. When, therefore, the Prince of Moliterno went to request Championnet not to enter Naples, a demand which the general (who considered the amistice as having been broken) roughly rejected, the *lazzaroni* denounced him as a traitor, seized again the arms which they had laid down and dragged several pieces of cannon to positions which commanded the approaches to the city. They then renewed their onslaught on persons reputed to be partisans of the French, plundering and burning their houses until, towards nightfall, Cardinal Capece-Zurlo, the Archbishop, succeeded in calming their fury. They marched out on the following day with the intention

of seizing the French camp near Aversa, but were repulsed with heavy loss, and during their absence the revolutionists, who were now all united in desiring the coming of the French as their only safeguard against this state of anarchy, took by surprise the castle of Saint Elmo, the most important of the Neapolitan fortresses. On January 21 Championnet, whose army now amounted to over 22,000 men, attacked Naples from three sides, and though the city was not protected by walls of bastions, the *lazzaroni,* aided by a few thousand of the disbanded foreign soldiers of the royal army, disputed every inch of the ground with such courage and tenacity, though cannonaded by the castle of St. Elmo and repeatedly charged with the bayonet, that it was only after a combat of three days that the French overcame their opposition and were masters of the capital.

The *lazzaroni,* decimated and exhausted by a struggle which had lasted sixty-seven hours, offered no further resistance to the revolution, and Championnet proceeded to inaugurate the new commonwealth, which took the name of the Parthenopean Republic. He appointed a provisional government, with Carlo Lauberg, an unfrocked monk, as President, which under the influence of Bassal introduced the French republican calendar, decreed the formation of a national guard and divided the kingdom into eleven departments. A war tax of 2,500,000 *livres tournois* was imposed on Naples and one of 15,000,000 on the provinces. It must be said, however, to the credit of Championnet, that he expelled from Naples the French Commissioner Faypoult, whose plundering he considered to be on too large a scale, but he was recalled in consequence by the Directory and replaced by General MacDonald.

In order to cause the authority of the provisional government to be acknowledged in the provinces and its representatives accepted, General Duhesme was sent with three columns toward Lucera and Foggia, meeting with no resistance until reaching San Severo, a town in the neighborhood, where on February 25 he fought against a royalist army of 12,000 men composed of peasants and disbanded soldiers, defeated them with a loss of 3,000 men and then plundered the town. Another expedition under General Broussier was sent in March to relieve Bari, the inhabitants of which were republican and had held out against royalist bands for over a month. On their way the French attacked Andria, and though repulsed at first, took it, burned it and massacred 4,000 of the inhabitants. Trani underwent the same fate on April 25, though it was defended house by house after the walls had been scaled by surprise. It was plundered and burned, "and this once beautiful, rich and populous city was changed into an abode of misery and desolation." Even Bari was not saved by its republicanism from the imposition of a war

tax of 40,000 ducats and the payment of forced contributions for the support of the army.

The courage which these towns displayed in maintaining their fidelity to the cause of royalty is a proof that the entire kingdom was far from following the example of the capital, where since so many years the ideas of the French philosophers had been spread among the aristocracy and the middle class; but in many provincial towns the Jacobins, owing to their better organization, had been able to impose their will on the royalists and establish a republican form of government. Nevertheless, the partisans of the Bourbons, though scattered and disorganized, were so numerous that the presence of a representative of the crown would suffice to rally them and enable them to restore to his throne a sovereign who had been overthrown by a foreign invader rather than by the will of his subjects. It was for this reason that, shortly after the arrival of Ferdinand IV. in Sicily, Cardinal Fabrizio Ruffo was chosen by him to be his lieutenant, with the title of vicar general and with full powers for the reconquest and reorganization of the kingdom, and on February 8, 1799, he landed at Catona, on the coast of Calabria, with a few companions and a sum of only 3,000 ducats. He was met by a body of three hundred of the tenants of his family, which owned extensive possessions in that province, and immediately issued an address to the Bishops and the clergy, calling upon them to make the people take arms for the defense of religion, of their King and of their country. His appeal met with a response which surpassed his expectations. From all sides the people, led by their priests and wearing white crosses in their hats, thronged around him, and in a few days two camps were formed of several thousand men each—at Palmi, for those from the low country; at Mileto, for those from the mountains. Out of this crowd of badly armed volunteers, which comprised rich landowners, townsmen, peasants, workingmen, disbanded soldiers and retainers of noble houses (armigeri baroniati), Cardinal Ruffo, who throughout the campaign displayed the talents of a great administrator and of a great general, succeeded in organizing an efficient army,[9] which when he passed it in review towards the end of April, when it had been two months in the field, was composed of ten battalions of 500 men each, consisting of soldiers of the disbanded regular army, while the irregular troops formed 100 companies of 100 men each. He had also 1,200 horsemen and eleven field pieces. The Cardinal had also organized a commissariat, and to provide pay for the troops he sequestrated the revenues of the landed proprietors who were residing not on their

[9] Abate Domenico Sacchinelli, "Memorie storiche sulla vita del Cardinale Fabrizio Ruffo," Napoli, 1836.

lands, but in Naples. The towns in the province of Calabria, where the republicans had most power, were Monteleone, whence they fled on the Cardinal's approach; Catanzaro, where the royalists rose and expelled them; Cotrone, which the royal army stormed and plundered, and Altamura, from which its defenders fled at night after making a short resistance and shooting in cold blood fifty of its royalist inhabitants.

The Cardinal had not to fear any opposition to his progress from the French, for the war which had again broken out between France and Austria in Switzerland (on March 6) and in Lombardy (on March 26, 1799) had proved so disastrous to the armies of the republic, especially when on the arrival of a strong Russian contingent the command of the allied armies was given to Marshal Suvaroff, that it became necessary to recall General MacDonald from Naples. He therefore broke up his camp at Caserta on May 7, leaving a garrison of 3,000 men at Capua and of 700 both in the castle of Saint Elmo and in the fortress of Gaeta, and marched with 7,000 in two columns by Itri and San Germano. That which took the latter road was commanded by General Watrin and was that which had invaded Apulia under General Duhesme. The soldiers who composed it, brutalized by the atrocities they had committed, "seemed especially anxious to shed the blood of priests, but every human being who came within their reach fell pierced with bullets." They massacred some Trappists in a monastery near Veroli; they burned part of the town of San Germano and plundered the monastery of Monte Cassino; they took, after five hours of desperate fighting, the town of Isola, which had been strongly barricaded, plundered it and reduced it to a heap of ashes; while the column under General MacDonald had to fight its way through the defiles of Itri and Fondi, "losing men and baggage at every step."[10]

After taking the chief towns in Calabria the march of Cardinal Ruffo was continued through the other provinces without meeting with serious resistance until he reached Naples. Near Manfredonia he was joined by a detachment of 480 Russian marines and later on by some Turks. The Neapolitan republicans established a fortified camp at the Ponte della Madalena, an adjacent fort, and gunboats

[10] "Thiebault," Vol. II., p. 324: "Peu d'insurrections ont ete aussi formidables. C'etait une croisade: or, ainsi que je l'ai dit, apres nous avoir forces a les mepriser comme soldats ces Napolitains nous avaient appris a les redouter comme hommes . . . c'est, pour ainsi dire lorsqu'il n'y eut plus d'armee Napolitains que le guerre de Naples devint effrayante. Quoique as Napolitains de 1798 farouches et superstitieux aient ete battus partout, quoique sans compter les pertes qu'ils firent dans les combats, plus de 60,000 des leurs aient ete passes au fil de l'epee sur les decombres de leurs villes ou sur les cendres de leurs chaumieres nous ne les avons laisses vaincus sur ancun point."

commanded by Admiral Caracciolo also commanded the position; but on June 13 it was stormed by the Calabrian bands, which after a few days' more fighting were masters of Naples. The *lazzaroni* in the meanwhile had arisen against the republicans and slaughtered all the partisans of the French who fell into their power, in spite of the efforts of the Cardinal to restore order. The forts of the *Castle Nuovo* and the *Castle del Novo* soon capitulated, and though the Cardinal consented to allow the Neapolitan prisoners to leave for France together with the French soldiers, Nelson on his arrival with the English fleet refused to recognize the capitulation and seized those who had the most active share in promoting the revolution, an action which has given rise to much bitter controversy which it would be impossible to examine here. The castle of St. Elmo capitulated shortly afterwards, and its commander, General Mejean, surrendered to the Neapolitan Government those of its subjects who had joined the French revolutionists and founded the Parthenopean Republic.

MacDonald's troops passed through Rome on the 16th and 17th of May, where they were reinforced by a few thousands of the division of General Garnier, who remained in command of the district with 2,400 men, while 1,900 of MacDonald's sick and wounded filled the hospitals. Garnier before long replaced the consuls by a provisional government, put Rome under martial law and tried to raise the national guard to the number of 10,000 men. A large number of towns and villages in the Papal States still showed the utmost hostility to the revolution. Civita Vecchia, rendered independent by the Neapolitan invasion in November, refused to submit to the Roman consuls, stood a regular siege, repelled several assaults of the French troops and capitulated only on March 7. The neighboring village of Tolfa was then attacked by the republican army and stormed, though defended house by house. It was reduced to ashes and 156 persons taken in arms were shot. In July an insurrection at Ronciglione was suppressed by the massacre of eighty-six of its citizens, but the armed bands of Rodio, Pandigrano and Michele Pezza, of Itri, better known under the name of *Fra Diavolo,* were advancing from the south, and though they were sometimes driven back by the French, they soon regained their positions and put themselves in communication with the bands coming from Tuscany.

There, on May 6, the citizens of Arezzo had revolted and, aided by the peasantry of the neighborhood, who came, led by their clergy, they had driven out the French garrison and formed a league known as the Federation of Arezzo, which barricaded the town and governed it in the name of the Grand Duke. Disciplined and led by an Austrian officer, Baron Schneider, they spread the insurrection

to the neighboring towns. Together with some Austrian troops they entered Florence on July 7 after it had been evacuated by the French troops. They took Perugia in August, Monte Rotondo and Finmicino in September, at which time only Rome and Ancona remained in the power of the French. The latter town and the adjacent provinces were defended by General Monnier against the bands of Ascoli and the Marches commanded by Donato de Donatis and Giuseppe Costantini, surnamed Sciabolone; but though winning many victories with a handful of troops, he was gradually driven back on Ancona, which after a brilliant fight of three months against an allied army of Austrians, Russians and Turks, he surrendered to the Austrians on November 13, 1799.

General Garnier, who could put only 2,000 men under arms, saw that further resistance was impossible; he did not wish to expose Rome to be taken by indisciplined mountaineers, and preferred, therefore, to negotiate with Commodore Troubridge, who commanded an English squadron then cruising before Civita Vecchia. He concluded with him a capitulation, by the terms of which Civita Vecchia, Corneto and Tolfa were to be occupied by the English and Rome by the Neapolitan troops of the regular army commanded by Marshal Burckhardt, a Swiss officer whom Cardinal Ruffo had sent forward after he had taken Naples. The French soldiers were allowed to keep their arms and the Romans who had been compromised in the revolution and who wished to leave were also to be brought to France by the English. Marshal Burckhardt entered Rome on September 30 and immediately formed a provisional government to take charge of the State in the name of the King of Naples.

A month previously to the overthrow of the republican government in Rome the sufferings of Pius VI. had come to an end at Valence, in the south of France, the last stage of the long and painful journey which the Directory had obliged him to perform without consideration for his age and his infirmities. At Bologna, through which the Holy Father passed on his way from the Certosa di Val d'Ema to Parma, he had been allowed to rest for a night at the Spanish College, but was brought away hastily on the following day, for the French troops had been defeated by the Austrians near Legnano, on the Adige, and it was feared that he might be rescued by the Imperialists. For the same reason his stay at Parma, where he was lodged at the monastery of St. John the Evangelist, was suddenly ended. An officer arrived at dawn on April 13 with a despatch from the Commander-in-Chief at Florence ordering the Holy Father to leave for Turin within two hours and stating that if the Duke of Parma hindered his departure or did not furnish him at once with everything requisite for his journey, Parma and

Piacenza should be treated as hostile towns. It was only on the production of certificates by two doctors testifying on oath that such was the state of exhaustion of the Holy Father that he could not be removed without endangering his life that the officer consented that the Pope's departure might be deferred till the following day. Pius VI., however, had expressed his resolution not to leave Parma, but the Duke's minister, the Marchese Ventura, represented to him so dolefully the dangers to which his refusal would expose Parma and its inhabitants, that the Pope, interrupting him in the course of his lamentations, answered calmly that he would be very sorry to be the cause of any misfortune to the Duke or his people; that he was resigned to the will of God, and that at any risk to himself he would continue his journey. He left Parma, therefore, at an early hour on April 14, and at the request of the French officer who escorted him, the Duke, who had no cavalry, furnished a guard of twelve halbardiers, who followed in carriages.[11]

The Holy Father passed that night at Borgo San Donino in the Bishop's palace and the next at the College of San Lazzaro, belonging to the missionaries of St. Vincent of Paul, near Piacenza. His journey next day by Lodi to Milan was interrupted, as it was reported that the Austrians were approaching, and he was again brought back to San Lazzaro; but only a short rest was allowed him, and at daybreak on the 17th he crossed the swollen waters of the Trebbia by a ferry. Castel San Giovanni, Voghera, Tortona, Allessandria, Casale and Crescentino were the stages by which Pius VI. reached Turin. With very few exceptions the people received him everywhere with signs of veneration and compassion, crowding around his carriage in the towns, and in the country hastening from a distance to kneel by the roadside and ask his blessing as he passed. At Voghera the French commandant had the courtesy to allow him to rest beyond the appointed time, but at Tortona the officer in command insisted on his immediate departure for Alessandria, and it was only because heavy rains had rendered impossible to ford the Scrivia, a mountain torrent which crossed the road, that he was allowed to remain for the night. The citizens of Tortona showed such indignation at this brutality that the commandant judged it prudent to put the garrison under arms, but Pius VI., with the courage and resignation which never abandoned him, calmly said:

[11] Abate Coppi, "Annali d'Italia dal 1750 al 1829," t. II., p. 15. In May, 1796, Bonaparte had made an armistice with the Duke of Parma, by the intervention of the Spanish Ambassadors which enabled him to remain independent from 1796 to 1801, on condition of paying 2,000,000 francs and furnishing 1,700 horses fully equipped, 10,000 quintaux of wheat, 5,000 of oats, 2,000 head of cattle and 20 paintings (1 quintal = 100 kilgrammes = 220 pounds).

"Everything depends on the will of God. We are in His hands; may His will be done." At Alessandria the Pope was received with enthusiasm by the people and by many of the aristocracy, who came a long way from the town to meet him. At Casale the national guard rendered him military honors on his arrival at the Bishop's palace, and he met with equal respect at the little town of Crescentino, where he passed the night in the house of the Fathers of the Oratory. General Grouchy, on the contrary, who commanded in Turin, irritated by seeing the people leave the city by thousands to salute the Holy Father, ordered his journey to be delayed at the village of Chivasso, where he was obliged to stay at a filthy inn until nightfall. Even then he was not allowed to pass through the streets of Turin in order to reach the citadel, but he was brought to it by a long and circuitous road outside the walls, broken up with deep ruts and quagmires, and so great were the sufferings he underwent that he fainted several times.

The general was persuaded by the prelates who accompanied the Holy Father to allow him to rest for a day before continuing his journey, but he would not permit him to have an interview with the Archbishop of Turin or with Don Pedro de Labrador, who had been just named representative of Spain in the place of Cardinal Lorenzana; and he made him leave Turin at midnight for Suza, at the foot of Mont Cenis, on the road to Grenoble, where he said the Directory intended that he should reside. The Holy Father arrived at Suza on the evening of April 26, where he was received with military honors and lodged in the Bishop's palace; but he was so exhausted that the commandant, who was more courteous and friendly than most of the officers of the republic, ventured to disobey the instructions he had received and consented to let him stay till the 28th. He also told the Pope that his destination was Briancon, and not Grenoble, and the commissioner who had accompanied him from Turin stated that General Grouchy had purposely concealed the fact, as he feared an outburst of indignation on the part of the citizens if they learned that the Sovereign Pontiff was to be imprisoned in a town situated high among the Alps with a rigorous climate. It was therefore necessary to dismiss, after satisfying their exorbitant demands, the drivers who had been hired for the crossing on Mont Cenis and to hire a sedan chair and bearers to bring the Holy Father over Mont Genevre by steep and rugged paths covered with snow, as well as mules for the prelates and attendants who accompanied him.

It was on April 30 that Pius VI. crossed the Mont Genevre. He had been detained for more than a day at the little village of Oulx, for a heavy fall of snow had covered the path leading over

the mountains and workmen had to be assembled from the environs to clear the way; but though the delay was involuntary, he was made to pay for the maintenance during that time of the detachment of cavalry which escorted him. At Briancon the Holy Father was respectfully received. The town was crowded with people from the neighborhood and the national guard came to meet him and render him military honors; but the Jacobin municipality, fearing a demonstration on the part of the Catholics, had decreed that the keys of the belfry and of the church should be kept in the town hall.

Pius VI. and a few of his servants were lodged in a house belonging to the hospital of the town, where they had four rooms. The sitting room was large, the windows had neither glass nor shutters, but were closed with linen, and the chimneys smoked. Some of the servants slept there, and when their beds had been removed in the morning Mass was said there, after which it served as a refectory for the Papal household. The Pope's bed room, where he remained all day, opened off this room. The prelates and the other priests who accompanied the Holy Father and formed the Papal household had lodgings in the town, but passed the day along with the Holy Father. Sentinels guarded the door and allowed no one to enter who was in the service of the Pope. The commissioner who represented the Directory in the town was named Berard, a man despised for his vice and his impiety, who reprimanded the commandant because his wife heard Mass in the Pope's apartment, and ordered her not to assist at it again.

The Austro-Russian troops were at that time not far from Briancon. Their leader, Marshal Suvaroff, had reconquered Lombardy and was still driving the armies of Moreau and Victor before him. He seized Tortona on May 9 and Novi on the 15th, and the Piedmontese peasantry were everywhere taking up arms against the French, undeterred by the atrocious cruelty with which these risings were suppressed. The citizens of Turin opened their gates to Suvaroff on the 26th, and on June 20 the citadel capitulated. A panic terror prevailed among the troops at Briancon; the forts round it were hastily armed and put in a state of defense, but Suvaroff, who, it was reported, had orders to rescue the Holy Father, and whose advanced posts had taken Suza on May 28, withdrew them on June 10 and marched in the direction of Parma.

A large number of Italian republicans, flying before the allied armies, had taken refuge in Briancon, and from hatred for the Church they sought to excite the authorities against the prelates of the Papal household by accusing them of manifesting their joy at the news of French defeats and Austrian victories; of corresponding secretly with the enemies of France and sending them plans of

the forts. Berard, who always tried to inflict as much annoyance as possible on the Holy Father, laid these denunciations before the commandant and requested him to send Pius VI. to some town in the interior of France; but a council of war held by the officers of the garrison rejected the accusations as calumnious and declared that the Directory alone had the power to order the Pope to be removed. Berard then applied to General Muller, who was in command of the department, and the general ordered the Pope and his household to be transferred to Grenoble, or, if he were too feeble to undertake the journey, he might remain at Briancon, while the prelates and the servants who were not absolutely necessary should leave.

The remonstrances and the supplications of the prelates could obtain no modification of this decision, though the commandant allowed them to delay their departure until they procured traveling carriages from Embrun; but when General Muller arrived at Briancon on June 7 he severely reprimanded the commandant for not having executed his orders and insisted that the Pope's household should leave immediately for Grenoble, and that Pius VI. should remain at Briancon. A strong protest against this act of injustice and cruelty was drawn up by the principal citizens of Briancon, but it was rejected by the general, who allowed only a few servants to remain with the Holy Father and but one priest, his confessor, Padre Girolamo Fantini, of the Trinitarian order, a very pious monk, but unused to the world and not fitted for the task of aiding the Holy Father with his advice in the intricate matters which he laid before him. On the evening before their departure the prelates had an audience of Pius VI., when he granted them all the faculties and privileges which are usually granted in the countries where the Church is openly persecuted, and named Mgr. Spina, Archbishop of Corinth, Apostolic Delegate with power to subdelegate his authority whenever he should judge it necessary for the greater glory of God and the advantage of souls. The Abate Marotti, his secretary, then said: "Let us pray to the Lord that we may not be hindered in the exercise of these faculties." This apparent want of confidence displeased the Holy Father, who replied in a loud voice: "When will you then leave aside these doubts of yours?" "Habete fiduciam!" They had a last interview with the Sovereign Pontiff on the morning of the 8th before they left, when he gave them his blessing and looking at them affectionately, merely said: *"Andate nel nome del Signore."* (Go in the name of the Lord.)

When the prelates arrived at Grenoble on the 12th they were closely guarded by sentinels at the inn where they had alighted and

were informed that on the following day they were to continue their journey to Dijon. By a happy coincidence, however, Don Pedro de Labrador, who had been vainly trying to find out to what place Pius VI. had been carried, arrived in Grenoble on the same day and hastened to visit the prisoners. He obtained from the general that they might remain at Grenoble, and some of them even were about to be allowed to return to Briancon when the Directory by a decree of 22 prairial an VII. (10 June, 1799) decided that Pius VI. was to be transferred to Valence, in the department of la Drome. A commodious carriage was therefore to be sent from Grenoble and a doctor, who should take charge of him during the journey, but though General Muller authorized the commandant of Briancon to delay the Pope's departure until their arrival, and though the surgeons of the hospital bore witness that the Holy Father was so infirm and feverish that he could not be removed without endangering his life, the commissioner of the Directory for the Department *des Hautes-Alpes,* whom Berard had asked to come to Briancon, insisted on his leaving and said: "Alive or dead, the Pope must be brought away to-morrow morning."

On the 27th of June, therefore, the Holy Father was carried by his servants down to the gates of the city (for no wheeled vehicles can pass through its steep and narrow streets), and there placed in a carriage which was little better than a cart. Padre Fantini sat beside him and two servants before him. A large number of soldiers had been put under arms to suppress any disturbance on the part of the inhabitants, but they could not prevent them from manifesting their grief and their indignation by their tears and the reproaches which they addressed to the representatives of the republic.

All that day the Pope remained in a state of lethargy, from which even the jolting of the carriage failed to arouse him. On the following day the commissioner who accompanied him refused to stop at Embrun, where the most distinguished citizens were anxious to receive the Sovereign Pontiff, but went on to the village of Savines, and there made him pass the night in a filthy inn, though the owner of a neighboring castle begged to be allowed the honor of offering him hospitality. Dr. Duchadez, who had been sent from Grenoble to attend the Holy Father and to whom General Muller had given full powers to regulate his journey as he might judge fit, met him not far from the town of Gap, where he made him rest for two days, and this repose so revived the Pope's strength that he was able to give audience to the administration of the department and to the municipal council.

The towns of Corps, la Mure and Vizille were the stages where the Holy Father stopped on his way from Gap to Grenoble, and

during this progress the people of the neighboring villages came from all sides to line the road along which he passed or surround the houses where he stopped and to testify by their enthusiasm that in spite of the persecution which the Catholic Church was even then still undergoing, the French people had not lost their faith.

The house of la Baronne de Vaulx at Grenoble, where Pius VI. was to reside, had been surrounded by guards in order to keep the people at a distance, but vast crowds left the city to greet him, and though the authorities, irritated at the sight of such enthusiasm, ordered the gates to be closed as soon as the Pope's carriage passed, other crowds assembled in the streets and accompanied him to his destination. There he had the happiness of being received by Mgr. Spina, Mgr. Caracciolo, the Abate Marotti, the Abate Baldassari and Padre Pio, of Piacenza, from whom he had been so long separated; while the people which thronged the street and filled the windows and covered the roofs of the surrounding houses, asked for his blessing with such persistency that the commissioner of the department, fearing a disturbance, allowed him to be carried to a window and shown to the crowd. Cries were at once raised of *"Viva la Saint Pere!"* but as the commissioner stood insolently beside him, wearing his hat, other cries were also raised of *"A bas le chapeau! A bas le commissaire!"* on which he angrily withdrew and closed the window.

The Holy Father, escorted by cavalry and gendarmes, continued his journey to Valence on July 10. The prelates and secretaries had left the day before, and his carriage was again surrounded by enthusiastic crowds, who barely left room for it to pass. Tullins, Saint Marcellin and Romans were the towns where he stopped, being received everywhere with the same demonstration of affection and respect, while some of those present uttered cries of indignation at the treatment to which the Holy Father was subjected and asked if he, too, were about to be led to the scaffold like their own priests.

The house where Pius VI. was to reside at Valence was situated in the citadel and had been occupied by the Governor of the town. The rooms were then completely bare and some noble families of the environs offered to send what should be necessary to furnish them, but the administration of the department refused to accept any loan from the aristocracy, and as nobody else offered anything the rooms were still unfurnished shortly before the Pope's arrival. Then the authorities announced their readiness to accept assistance from any one, and in less than forty-eight hours they received more furniture than was wanted.

The administrators of the department, who, with the exception

of one of their number were bitterly hostile to the Church, announced by a decree dated July 12, two days before the arrival of the Holy Father, that he was under arrest (*dans un etat de detention*), but that the persons along with him might circulate freely, on condition of not causing any assemblage, and both the Pope and his household were warned to be "very prudent in their language and to avoid any expression which might afford a pretext for malevolence or fanaticism." A strong guard prevented any one having access to the Holy Father without permission. There was a sentinel at the door of his room, and the thirty-two priests who were imprisoned in an adjacent monastery were not allowed to go into the courtyard of their prison at the same time that the Holy Father was carried out by his servants on the terrace in the garden of the citadel lest they should communicate with him by signs.

The Directory, apparently, still dreaded that the Pope, whom they regarded as a hostage, might be rescued from their power, and they therefore decreed on July 22 that he should be transferred to Dijon. On being informed by Mgr. Spina of this new act of barbarity, the Holy Father, with that patience and fortitude which never abandoned him, merely remarked: "Let it be as God wills. Truly we had hoped that we should have been allowed to remain here to die in peace. But in this, too, let the will of God be done." The paralysis from which the Holy Father had long suffered had since some time become more developed, and the doctors certified that it was absolutely impossible that he could leave Valence. Curnier, the commissioner of the department, had always shown himself well disposed to the Pope and willing to render his captivity less painful; he, too, was anxious that the Pope's journey should at least be deferred until he should regain his health, and he was therefore dismissed from his post and replaced by one Brosset, whom the Directors considered more adapted to carry out their views. But even the new commissioner and the administrators had to agree that it would be impossible to execute the decree, and on the 18th of August the Directors consented to suspend it.

The Holy Father had been able to take part in the devotions for the novena of the feast of the Assumption, but on the 27th of August, feeling his strength becoming exhausted, he asked to receive the Viaticum, which was administered to him by Mgr. Spina after Mgr. Caracciolo had recited for him the Profession of Faith, of which he was able to pronounce the last words. On the 18th he received Extreme Unction, and about midnight his household was warned that the end was near. The Holy Father could still, however, recognize them, and when Padre Fantini asked him to forgive his enemies, he was able to reply: *"Domini, ignosce illis."* Then

while Padre Fantini was reciting the prayers for a departing soul he gave his blessing three times to those standing round his bed, and a few minutes later tranquilly passed away. He was then aged 81 years, 8 months and 2 days and 24 years, 5 months and 14 days.

The authorities consented to allow the body of Pius VI. to be embalmed and placed in a leaden coffin, which remained exposed in the chapel of the citadel for nine days, according to the Roman usage, but the administrators made every effort to exclude the Catholics who came to pray around it, and finding that the national guard would not execute their orders, replaced them by a detachment of regular troops. The coffin was then deposited in a vault beneath the altar. Mgr. Spina and the Spanish Ambassador applied to the Directory for leave to transport the remains of Pius VI. to Rome, but their request was not answered, though the servants received passports and were allowed to leave.

On October 10 as the two prelates and the secretaries were walking on the road to Lyons they were overtaken by some carriages accompanied by an escort of gendarmes. In one of these was General Bonaparte, along with General Berthier, just returned from Egypt. Bonaparte questioned the prelates about Pius VI., whose death he deplored, and then asked them what were their plans. When he found that they could not obtain leave to convey the remains of the Pope to Rome, or even to correspond with their families, he expressed his indignation, and taking leave of them courteously, continued his journey. When the passports were furnished a few weeks later the exiles returned to Italy, with the exception of Mgr. Spina, who remained to watch over the tomb of the Sovereign Pontiff, and it was not until December 30 that Bonaparte, then First Consul, decreed that Pius VI. should be buried in France and a monument raised over his grave. The ceremony took place on January 30, 1801, when the remains of Pius VI. were interred in a specially constructed vault in the cemetery of Valence. There were no religious rites, for it had been the intention of the authorities that the constitutional clergy should have officiated on the occasion, but Mgr. Spina, anxious to prevent what would have been an insult to the deceased Pope, succeeded in persuading them to change their decision.

It was not until 1802 that the remains of Pius VI. found their proper resting place. On January 10 they were placed in charge of Mgr. Spina, who had come from Italy to receive them, and on February 17 they entered Rome by the Porta Flaminia. The richly decorated car which bore them was received by the clergy of Rome and by all the Bishops then present in the Eternal City and brought in procession to Saint Peter's, where Pius VII., surrounded by

eighteen Cardinals, was awaiting it, and they were placed in a temporary tomb until the time came to deposit them in the crypt of the basilica, and the statue which commemorates the illustrious Pontiff represents him kneeling in front of the tomb of the Apostle.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

SOME RECENTLY BEATIFIED MARTYRS.

THE persecution that is now being waged against Catholicism in France gives a special significance to the ceremony that took place in Rome on May 27 last. Without treating the separation of the Church and State, taken as a bare fact, as an unmitigated evil, it would be childish to ignore that in France, owing to attendant circumstances, it is fraught with grave danger to the cause of religion. Given the well-known opinions of the politicians who have brought it about, a change so radical cannot, in their hands, be innocent of evil.

The French Government, as our readers are aware, is at the present time in the possession of atheists and Freemasons, who openly express their determination to unchristianize the country. To them separation does not imply liberty and independence as regards the Church. It means not merely that she is no longer supported by the State, but that she is to be gradually and craftily despoiled of her possessions and influence. The art treasures that generations of believers have bestowed upon her will be taken away, her utterances and teaching will be hampered, her work maimed, her power restricted in every way.

The law, so severely condemned by Pius X., is full of hostile provisions, expressed in subtle language, but all tending to this result. In course of years the undying vitality of the Church will evidently assert itself and she will come out from the ordeal triumphant, but the present moment is none the less full of solemn import to the Catholics of France.

To minds familiar with the history of the terrible upheaval of 1789 there are symptoms abroad that are strangely significant. The suppression of religious orders throughout the country, the confiscation of their property, the attempts made to secure the allegiance of the clergy and detach it from Rome, all these things are merely a repetition of what happened in France at the outset of the great Revolution just a hundred and seventeen years ago.

Even the indifference and light-hearted frivolity with which a certain section of French Catholics look upon the events that are now taking place remind us of the careless "insouciance" of the nobles of the old régime, and the revolutionary spirit that is rampant throughout the land adds another alarming trait of resemblance to the parallel.

All these circumstances give a peculiar interest to the beatification of the sixteen Carmelite nuns that has lately taken place in Rome.

It is the first time that the Church has officially recognized the fact that among the hundreds of innocent men and women who perished on the scaffold in 1793 and 1794 a certain number were put to death solely from religious motives, apart from any political consideration.

The verdict of the Church in this matter has a twofold result: it illuminates with the golden halo of martyrdom some of the darkest pages of modern history, the horrors of which were hitherto unredeemed, and which now appeal to us in the same light as the heroic episodes of the early Church. Secondly, the honors paid to the Carmelites of Compiègne, we may hope, in due course of time, to see conferred on other religious men and women whose case is similar to theirs.

Thus the priests who in 1791 were butchered within the Paris prisons, the thirty-two nuns who in 1794 were beheaded at Orange and others no less heroic who perished at Valenciennes, were martyrs in the same sense of the Compiègne Carmelites and their "cause" is being minutely examined by the ecclesiastical authorities appointed for the purpose. In the evil days that have already dawned for the Church in France these examples are fraught with meaning, and to the persecuted religious and priests of the twentieth century they appeal with inexpressible earnestness.

The Carmelite monastery of Compiègne, of which sixteen members were solemnly beatified only a few days ago, was founded in 1641. Compiègne, a small town situated in the "département de l'Oise," possesses a royal palace where the court was accustomed to spend some weeks every year and a magnificent forest where Napoleon III. delighted to hunt. In fact, the town was one of the Emperor's favorite residences, and its splendor departed with the fall of the second empire.

The convent was swept away after the Revolution. It stood close to the royal palace and was placed under the patronage of the Annunciation of Our Lady. Many pretty stories are told in the convent annals of the cordial relations that existed between the daughters of St. Teresa and their royal neighbors. We hear of Louis XIV. as a small boy visiting the nuns and holding tightly clasped in his little hands a golden chalice which his mother, the

Queen Regent, presented to the community. His younger brother, the Duke d'Orleans, was fond of putting on an apron and helping the "soeur cuisinière," much, we may believe, to the latter's dismay. Many, many years later, when the close of his brilliant reign was marked by public reverses and family bereavements, Louis XIV. again visited the convent. He spoke much of his mother and inquired if any nuns were still living who remembered her. The neglected consort of Louis XV., Mary Leckzinska; her daughter-in-law, Maria Josepha of Saxony, and her unmarried daughters, "Mesdames de France," were on affectionate terms with the Carmelites. Sometimes, says the convent journal, the Queen brought her work; the Dauphiness, Maria Josepha, did likewise and, adds our annalist, her fingers often bled when she stitched coarse garments for the poor. One day the Queen, whose feet were cold, asked the prioress to allow the nuns to dance a "ronde" with her that she might get warm. The permission, as may be imagined, was readily granted.

Among the young princesses who on these occasions accompanied their mother was one Madame Louise, who absorbed the influence of the Carmelites more earnestly than the rest, and when some years later she made up her mind to join their order, she secretly applied to the prioress of Compiègne to procure her a hair shirt. This she wore under her royal robes until she had won her father's permission to enter the Carmelite Convent of St. Denis.

The close neighborhood of the court and the friendliness with which its inmates treated the nuns in no way infringed upon the latter's religious habits of humility and penance. In all respects the community was a model one, and the reports of its ecclesiastical superiors during the eighteenth century are unanimous in praising the zeal and fervor with which the nuns observed their rule. Their devotional spirit was, we are told, further stimulated by a curious prophecy that was handed down from one generation of religious to another. It implied that a bloody upheaval would take place in the country, during which a community of women would perish for the cause of religion.

This prophecy formed a frequent subject of conversation among the nuns, and when towards 1789 the political horizon grew more and more threatening and the attitude of the government became openly anti-religious, they were naturally inclined to wonder whether its fulfillment might not be at hand, but fearful of seeming presumptions, they hardly ventured to express a hope that the crown of martyrdom alluded to might be their portion.

At this critical juncture the community was governed by a woman who, both in a natural and in a supernatural point of view, was a worthy daughter of St. Teresa. Madeleine Claudine Lidoine,

prioress of the monastery, was born in Paris in 1752 and baptized in the Church of St. Sulpice. Her family being in straitened circumstances, the small sum required by the Carmelites from their postulants was paid on her behalf by the young Dauphiness, Marie Antoinette, at the request of Madame Louise de France, the royal Carmelite of St. Denis. Out of gratitude Madeleine Claudine on taking the habit assumed the same religious name as her protectress—Teresa of St. Augustin.

She had been carefully educated, and from her letters and the testimony of those who knew her best she seems to have combined in a singular degree a wise and well balanced intelligence, a warm and loving heart, great courage and presence of mind. To these natural gifts she added the virtues of a perfect religious and a spirit of heroic generosity and self-sacrifice that she communicated to her Sisters. These, through circumstances of no common difficulty, remained peacefully and happily disciplined under her motherly rule. To the last tragic scene, when at the foot of the scaffold she stood at the head of her little band, she was deeply conscious of her responsibilities; forgetful of self, her one thought was to sustain her spiritual daughters through their ordeal, and, faithful to her mission, she insisted on being executed the last.

The other nuns form a compact group, among which stands out the ex-prioress, Mother Henrietta of Jesus, who was mistress of novices when the Revolution broke out. She was Mademoiselle de Croissy, a great niece of the Minister Colbert, and she became a nun when only sixteen. Her sweetness and kindness of heart made her generally beloved. Between her and the prioress there existed a close friendship, and Mother Henrietta's influence powerfully contributed to support her Sisters in their upward path.

Like the prioress, she was pursued by the thought of martyrdom. In 1792 her novices presented her, on the occasion of her feast, with a picture and some verses that seemed to point to suffering and death. "Oh, my child, God grant that you may be right," she exclaimed. About the same time Mother Teresa of St. Augustin, with an intimate conviction that a violent death awaited her community, proposed to her Sisters that they should daily offer their lives to God as a peace offering for their country.

These forebodings seemed justified by the distinctly irreligious policy of the National Assembly. In February, 1790, it suppressed religious orders throughout the country, and six months later its delegates visited the convent of Compiègne and informed the nuns that "their fetters were broken" and that they were free to leave the monastery. The Carmelites seem to have been in no hurry to take advantage of a privilege that they had neither sought nor

desired. Each member of the community was called up separately and asked whether she wished to return to the world. The answers are expressed in different words and bear the impress of the distinct personality of the speaker, but the same spirit reigned throughout, and evidently in this matter, as in all else, the Carmelites were of one mind and one heart. All stated that their desire was to remain within the convent walls, Mother Henrietta adding that she "eagerly seized this opportunity of renewing her religious promises." Another protested that she was resolved to keep her rule and habit "at the cost of her blood, if necessary." The lay Sisters proved no less courageous. "Nothing shall make me forsake Our Lord Jesus Christ, my Divine Spouse," said Soeur Verolat.

During two more years the religious were allowed to remain within their monastery walls. They continued to lead their usual life of penance and of prayer, while throughout the kingdom the tide of revolution and anarchy was increasing in violence, threatening to overthrow both the King's throne and God's altars. Although separated from the outer world by their rule, the nuns during these two years of anxiety and suspense were kept informed of the storm that was gathering. Many priests and a few faithful Catholic men and women found their way to the convent and came away soothed and strengthened by their intercourse with its inmates. The Carmelites looked upon the future with untroubled eyes, not that they were blind to the perils ahead, but they were ready to face the worst and were accustomed in their daily conversations to talk of the possibility of the old prophecy being fulfilled in their persons. One Sister owned to her confessor that these conversations were painful to her. She was, we are told, young and timid and secretly dreaded the thought of the "guillotine" and its attendant horrors. "My child," kindly replied the priest, "when your Sisters talk thus, does it really hurt you?" "No, father." "Now, if you were led to prison would you suffer tortures?" "No, father." "Let us imagine that you are condemned to death, would your sufferings be beyond bearing?" "No." "Now you ascend the scaffold and are told to bend your head under the knife; is this in itself acute pain?" "Not yet, father." "Well, the knife falls, and before you realize that this is death you are safe in heaven. Are you still so frightened?" "No indeed, father." This poor little Sister proved, when the hour of trial came, as brave and as cheerful as the rest.

At last, in August, 1792, the Carmelites were informed that within the space of two months they must leave their convent, which was to be seized by the State. The blow was not unforeseen, and the nuns had decided that whatever happened they would remain

together and continue to practice their rule under the government of their prioress. Mother Teresa, yielding to their wishes, secured lodging for her community in the town, and thither, after taking off their beloved religious habit, which they were now forbidden to wear, the nuns repaired on September 14, 1792. It was the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, a curiously significant anniversary for those who were entering on a path full of difficulty and suffering.

The lodgings where the Carmelites took refuge on leaving their monastery still exist. They are situated near the Church of St. Antoine, the "curé" of which, although he had taken the schismatical oath required by the government from the French clergy, was kindly disposed towards the Sisters. He allowed their chaplain to say Mass in the church and even appointed one chapel to be kept exclusively for their use.

Only a few days after their dispersion the nuns, who were now divided into three groups, were summoned by the prioress to meet the Mayor of Compiègne, who had a grave communication to make to them. To understand the part that this episode played in their future history and ultimate fate, we must remember that the French Revolution was anti-religious in its spirit and proceedings. The oath required of the priests, which is known as the "Constitution civile du clergé," was condemned by the Pope Pius VI. as unlawful, and hundreds of faithful confessors suffered poverty, exile, imprisonment and death itself rather than take it. But another oath, couched in other terms, was demanded of all men and women who were pensioned by the State, and the Carmelites, after the confiscation of their property, came under this head. It ran thus: "I swear to be faithful to the nation, to uphold liberty and equality and to die at my post." The formula seems simply harmless and even absurd where women were concerned. The Pope, to whom it was submitted, had not condemned it, and the superior of St. Sulpice, M. Emery, a prominent member of the ecclesiastical body, pronounced it to be harmless. The same opinion was professed by the Carmelites' superior, M. Rigand, and by their chaplain, Abbé Courouble. It was to induce the nuns to subscribe to this oath that the Mayor of Compiègne, M. de Cayrol, begged them to meet him at the prioress' rooms. He assured them that he had no desire to persuade them to make any concession that their conscience might reprove, but that merely for the sake of insuring their safety he begged them to write their names at the bottom of a blank page. To this the prioress objected that neither she nor her Sisters were willing to sign a page that might possibly be filled up by a formula of which they disapproved. The Mayor insisted that what he

required from them was merely a promise to do nothing against public peace and order. Trusting to his good faith, Mother Teresa and her daughters consented to affix their names to the paper, but some days later, they heard that the Mayor, contrary to what he had promised, had filled up the page with a declaration stating that the Camelites had subscribed to the oath "liberte égalite."

The first impulse of the nuns on hearing of the trap into which they had fallen was to protest against the Mayor's want of good faith. Although the oath was generally looked upon as lawful by the clergy in the north of France, their natural instinct prompted them to reject it. However, their friends urged them to refrain from moving in the matter at so critical a moment. They therefore consented, somewhat unwillingly, to remain silent, but we shall see how, at no distant period, they fearlessly disowned the unfair use that had been made of their signatures. For the time being they continued, as best they could, to observe their rule and, in spite of the difficulties of their position, they clung to their religious life. The departure of their chaplain, who in November, 1792, was expelled from Compiègne, deprived them of his spiritual ministrations. Their conscience forbade them to have recourse to the schismatical clergy who were in possession of the parish churches, and the faithful priests who had rejected the oath could only exercise their ministry with the utmost secrecy. In spite, however, of these spiritual privations and of material difficulties that increased daily, the nuns spent the year 1793 and the first months of 1794 in comparative peace. Several among them were strongly urged by their families to leave Compiègne, but nothing could break their resolve to remain together under the rule of their prioress, whose wisdom and prudence kept up the closest and most loving union between the different members of her scattered flock. The three groups were in constant communication with each other and with the prioress, and the increasing violence of the Revolution, the excesses of the Reign of Terror only stimulated the generous aspirations of these holy souls. They continued to offer themselves to God as voluntary victims for the crimes of their country, but although she was the first to encourage them in this generous oblation of their lives, Mother Teresa was careful to avoid any idle demonstrations. "May God preserve me," she used to say, "from exposing my Sisters to needless danger or pain."

In June, 1794, the mother prioress, although unwilling to leave Compiègne, was obliged to go to Paris, where urgent business matters claimed her attention. Here she found another member of her community, Sister Mary of the Incarnation, whom she had allowed to come to Paris some weeks previously on a similar errand.

The Reign of Terror was then at its worst. The King and Queen had already perished, together with hundreds of innocent persons of all rank and age. The hideous "guillotine," after being erected on what is now the Place de la Concorde, had been transferred, on June 17, 1794, to the Place de la Nation, where from forty to fifty victims were daily put to death. One day the two religious found themselves close to the carts in which the condemned prisoners were seated and which were slowly wending their way along the Rue St. Antoine. Sister Mary of the Incarnation, to whom we owe these and many other valuable details regarding the community, tells us that her first impulse was to draw back. "Oh, no," said the prioress; "let us remain and see how saints go to their death." Two of the victims looked steadily at the Carmelites. "They seem to say, 'Soon you will follow us,'" exclaimed the Sister. "What happiness it would be if God bestowed such a grace upon us," was the prioress' earnest answer. The next day she heard that a young girl had just died at Passy in odor of sanctity. On her death bed she opened her eyes wide at the sight of a vision that remained invisible to those around her. "I see," she exclaimed, "a community of nuns wearing white mantles; they perish together on the scaffold and heaven opens to receive them!"

Mother Teresa was deeply impressed by the tale. "I hardly venture to hope," she humbly said, "that it is our community whom God calls to so happy a fate."

A few days later, on June 21, the prioress returned to Compiègne. It was agreed that her companion, whose business was not completed, would join the community later. Little did the two religious imagine that the meeting to which they looked forward would take place not in this world, but in the next. News of grave import awaited Mother Teresa on her arrival. The Sisters who came to meet her informed her that they had been denounced as "fanatics," who continued to live under religious rule. In consequence their lodgings had just been ransacked and their papers carried away. These consisted of letters on spiritual subjects, hymns, prayers and other devotional papers, to which were added some rosaries, scapulars and pictures of the Sacred Heart.

Such as they were, these apparently harmless documents were pronounced by the revolutionary committee to prove that the nuns were endeavoring to "reëstablish royalty" and to "destroy the republic." In consequence they were immediately put under arrest.

Five of the religious lived in a house belonging to M. and Mme. de la Vallée, whose direct descendant is still alive. His great-grandmother was a young girl in 1794. She remembered how, when the nuns were led away, the sub-prioress courteously thanked

M. and Mme. de la Vallée for marks of kindness received during their stay. "We leave you all we possess," she added. "If we return, you will give us back what is ours, but if we do not, pray keep these things in remembrance of us and as a testimony of our gratitude."

The sixteen Carmelites were taken to a former convent of the Visitation that served as a prison. It was already inhabited by a community of English Benedictine nuns from Cambrai who had been arrested in the previous month of October and whose sufferings from cold and hunger during the winter had been severe. No communication was allowed between the two communities, but in a letter written after her release the Benedictine abbess, Dame Mary Blyde, owns that twice she succeeded in speaking to the Carmelites "with great fear."

While their fate was being discussed before the revolutionary committees in Paris, where their papers had been forwarded, the daughters of St. Teresa were calmly preparing for death. Their first move on being imprisoned was to send for the new Mayor of Compiègne, a revolutionist named Scellier, to inform him of the trap which his predecessor, M. de Cayrol, had laid for them. They now one and all repudiated the oath "liberté egalite" and required the Mayor to insert their protestation in the official register of the "maisie." They knew that this act meant certain death, but although the oath had not been formally condemned, they had been lately informed that it was blamed by the Bishop of Soissons and that in the south of France it was universally rejected as schismatical. The case was a complex one, and M. Emery on the one hand, the Bishop of Soissons on the other, were equally in good faith; but the Carmelites disregarded these subtle arguments and went straight to what was the most perfect and most perilous line of conduct—the uncompromising rejection of a doubtful formula.

After three weeks' stay in the prison of Compiègne the nuns were transferred to Paris, where they were to be judged. They were informed of the fact on July 13, and they understood from the words in which the Mayor Scillier conveyed the intelligence that the sacrifice they had so earnestly contemplated from afar was now close at hand.

In a valuable account of their imprisonment written by one of the English Benedictines, Anne Teresa Partingdon, mention is made of the departure of the chosen band. The English annalist tells us that they left the prison "like saints." Before taking their place in the carts they affectionately embraced each other and with cordial gestures they bade adieu to their fellow-prisoners.

At three in the afternoon the carts, escorted by nine soldiers and

two policement, started. The nuns, whose hands were tied behind their backs, sat calm and recollected. Probably during the long, weary journey they recited some of the prayers that, in happier days, they were in the habit of repeating in their convent chapel or prepared themselves by silent meditation for the sacrifice that they were about to offer. They reached Seulis at eleven o'clock, but only stopped to change horses and pursued their journey along the rough and lonely roads in the silence of the night.

Next day, under the burning heat of a July sun, the carts entered the great city, where at that moment terror reigned supreme. They proceeded to the prison of the Conciergerie, the "ante-room of the guillotine," as it was called, and drove into the large court, la "Cour de Mai," the aspect of which is much the same now as it was in 1794. The wide staircase that still exists was generally crowded with a tumultuous and bloodthirsty multitude, men and women, who reveled in sights of horror and who feasted their eyes on the departure of the condemned prisoners for the scaffold and on the arrival of new victims destined to share the same fate. Mingling with these fiends in human shape, whose presence at all the worst scenes of the Revolution proves to what depths human nature can sink, were sometimes friends and well-wishers of the prisoners, and it is to one of these, Mlle. Fouchet, that we owe the account of the nuns' arrival.

They had performed the long journey with their hands bound, and were numb and stiff in consequence. One of the elders, Sister Charlotte of the Resurrection, endeavored in vain to obey the guards who bade her alight from the cart. Furious at the poor woman's incapacity to move, one of the men seized her and roughly threw her on to the stone pavement. Even the mob protested. "You have killed her," indignantly exclaimed the bystanders. The old nun, streaming with blood, struggled to her feet. "Believe me," she said, turning to her enemy, "I bear you no ill will, but I thank you for not having killed me; if you had done so, I should have been deprived of the joys of martyrdom, to which I am looking forward."

The Conciergerie was at that time crowded with prisoners who were waiting to be judged and executed, for in most cases the terms were synonymous. They were huddled together in filthy dungeons, deprived of all save the barest necessities of life, and every day a certain number were brought before the tribunal and summarily condemned without being allowed to put in a word for their defense. It had been decided that in order to hasten proceedings they should no longer have a counsel, and the execution invariably took place a few hours after the sentence had been rendered.

We should know nothing of the Carmelites' sojourn at the Con-

ciergerie were it not for the single testimony of a peasant named Blot, one of the few prisoners who, having crossed the threshold of the "ante-room of the guillotine," lived to tell the tale. He came from Orleans and seems to have been a worthy man whom the "concierge" of the prison employed as a servant. Owing to this circumstance Blot had free access to the other prisoners and was fortunate enough to escape being sent before the dread tribunal. When, after the Revolution, Sister Mary of the Incarnation, the historian of the community, collected evidence regarding her martyred Sisters, she went to Orleans and the details that she gathered from the lips of the honest peasant are inexpressibly touching. He told her how "these holy ladies," as he called them, arrived at the Conciergerie on the 13th of July, a Sunday, and remained there till the 17th, when they were executed. One of them, he said, begged him to give her a piece of burnt wood and a scrap of paper. With this she wrote a hymn, composed on the lines and to the tune of the "Marseillaise." Sister Mary of the Incarnation was able to copy it some months later, and thus it has come down to us. The verses, insignificant in a literary point of view, breathe a spirit of heroic enthusiasm. Blot added that on the 16th, feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, the nuns seemed to celebrate a solemn anniversary. Their sweetness, serenity and evident gladness impressed him deeply. They appeared, he said, to be "going to a marriage feast," and were radiantly happy.

On the morning of the 17th they were informed that they were to be judged immediately. Our readers are already acquainted with Mother Teresa of St. Augustin, the leader of the little band, and with Mother Henrietta of Jesus, the mistress of novices, her right hand in all things. The others were: Sister Charlotte de la Resurrection, whose forgiving spirit revealed itself on her arrival at the Conciergerie, and Marie of Jesus Crucified, also an aged religious; the sub-prioress, Mother St. Louis; the portress, Mother of the Heart of Jesus; Mother Teresa of St. Ignatius, surnamed by her Sisters "the hidden treasure," and Sister Euphrasee, who had been Queen Mary Leckzinska's special favorite, were all women in the prime of life. Sister Louise Julie de Jesus was a widow, whose broken heart found peace in the cloister; Sister Marie Henrietta Petras, a lovely woman from the south of France, who possessed the enthusiasm of her race; she was only thirty-two, but younger still was Sister Constance, the novice whose family had made many vain attempts to induce her to leave her community. Added to these eleven choir nuns were three lay Sisters, as brave and devoted as the rest, and two "tourières," or outside servants, who were bound to the nuns only by ties of affection and who voluntarily shared their fate.

Such were the sixteen victims who on the fateful 17th of July appeared before the revolutionary tribunal, together with seventeen other persons. One and all were accused of having "conspired against the sovereignty of the people," but the Carmelites' position was rendered still more perilous from the fact that they had openly refused to take the oath "liberté egalite"—a mortal offense—and because scapulars, hymns and letters on religious topics had been found in their possession.

Summing up the case, the public accuser declared that the women, who sat so serene and still while their fate hung in the balance, were "thirsting to see liberty drowned in torrents of blood."

As we have already mentioned, during the last days of the Reign of Terror the most elementary forms of justice were cast aside; the prisoners were often not informed beforehand of the charges brought against them and were never allowed to defend themselves. However, Sister Mary of the Incarnation, whose information was gathered from eye-witnesses, tells us that the prioress interfered once or twice in the debates in the interests of the Sisters. She did so with a presence of mind, a firmness and dignity that are in keeping with all we know of her character.

The president having accused her of keeping firearms in her house, "Here," she replied, producing a crucifix, "is the only weapon we possess, and you are not able to prove that we ever had any other."

She also repudiated the accusation of having corresponded on political subjects, but acknowledged that she had corresponded on purely spiritual matters with the exiled chaplain of the community, and she generously assumed the undivided responsibility of what was looked upon as a crime. "You cannot," she urged, "punish my Sisters for an act where they had no part. I alone am responsible; my Sisters are innocent." And when the president replied that the other nuns were her accomplices, she attempted to save the "tourières," who, being the paid servants of the community, were "obliged to obey the orders that they received."

The real crime of the sixteen Carmelites lay in their devotion to their religious rule, and they were condemned to death "for having kept up a fanatical correspondence," for "holding anti-revolutionary meetings," etc., etc. The word "fanatic" in revolutionary parlance meant religious. It attracted the attention of one of the nuns, Sister Mary Henrietta Petras, and she begged the Judge to explain its significance. "I mean," he angrily replied, "your attachment to childish superstitions, to silly practices of religion." With a radiant look of happiness the Sister turned to the prioress. "You hear," she exclaimed, "we are to die for the sake of our holy faith. . . . What happiness it is to die for one's God!"

The sixteen religious returned to the Conciergerie with a light step, and their sweet serenity moved the peasant, Denis Blot, to tears. He wept bitterly on hearing that they were to be executed that same evening, and the nuns had to comfort their new-found friend. "Why do you weep?" said one of them. "Our sufferings are about to end. Pray for us, and this evening when we reach heaven we will not forget you."

It was, as we learn from the memoirs of the time, difficult to procure food at the Conciergerie, and at midday the Carmelites were still fasting. With motherly forethought the prioress felt that she must sustain her daughters' physical strength no less than their moral courage, and by disposing of a pelisse belonging to the subprioress she was able to procure for each one a cup of chocolate. After partaking of this last refreshment the nuns began to recite the Office for the Dead, and they were still praying when the summons came.

According to a tradition, the Carmelites went to execution wearing the white mantles of their order that they had brought with them from Compiègne. Sister Mary of the Incarnation, however, does not mention the fact. Another well authenticated tradition tells us that when they were seated in the carts that were to convey them to the place of execution the nuns began to sing the "Te Deum" and the "Salve Regina." The distance was great between the prison of the Conciergerie, situated in the island "de la Cité," and the Place de la Nation that lies at the extremity of Paris, near the "Porte de Vincennes," and as the mournful procession proceeded along the crowded streets the little band of sweet-faced, singing women attracted general attention. Forty victims were executed that day, but among them the Carmelites were, naturally enough, the most prominent, and the sound of their glad voices singing the hymns of the Church seems to have hushed the rough and hostile multitude. For once the mob refrained from insulting the victims.

One of the most touching circumstances connected with the Reign of Terror is the devotedness with which the spiritual needs of the condemned prisoners were ministered to by a certain number of priests, who were appointed by M. Bechet, vicar general of Paris, to follow the carts from the prison to the scaffold. Each in turn these courageous men, closely disguised, kept as close as possible to the tumbrils and gave the victims a last absolution. On Thursday, the day of the Carmelites' execution, the priest on duty was a certain Abbé Renaud, but we have no means of knowing whether he was able to fulfill his mission. Be this as it may, when towards 7 o'clock in the evening the mournful procession reached the "place,"

the sixteen Carmelites had lost none of their joyous serenity. They gathered round their prioress and, falling on their knees, they sang the "Veni Creator" and then renewed their baptismal and religious vows. For the only time during the Revolution the guards, the executioner and the bystanders seemed awed by the mere presence of the victims. Not a murmur was heard while the nuns quietly performed their acts of devotion.

When they rose the prioress, who had begged that she might be executed the last, took up her station at the foot of the "guillotine," and one by one as their names were called her daughters knelt down to receive her blessing. The first to die was the novice, Sister Constance. She walked up the bloody staircase with a light step, singing the "Laudate Dominum, omnes gentes." Fifteen voices took up the strain. Then as one head fell after another the voices were silenced, and at last the prioress sang alone.

Then she, too, followed. The souls that had been committed to her guardianship were safe in the Lord's arms. Through the sorrows and perils of the last weary years she had kept her daughters closely and happily united to God and to one another. Her task was over, and, free from all anxiety, she might now lay down her heavy weight of responsibility and go to her rest.

The bodies of the victims were taken at nightfall to a deserted sand pit at a short distance from the "place," and it is here that the Carmelites lie, together with thirteen hundred and seven victims who were executed between the 17th of June and the 27th of July, when the fall of Robespierre put an end to the Reign of Terror.

After the Revolution the spot was bought by a Princess Hohenzollern, whose brother, the Prince of Salm, was among the dead. She built a wall round the little cemetery, which still belongs to her family. It is German property, and is thus safe to remain untouched among the changes and vicissitudes that for the last hundred years have swept over France.

Adjoining the enclosure, still call "le cimetierè des guillotinés," is another cemetery, a church and a convent. These were founded by the children and grandchildren of those who perished on the "Place de la Nation." The convent belongs to the Sisters of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, commonly called the Sisters of Picpus. They were, like all teaching orders, condemned by M. Combes, and had already prepared to leave when, through some unexplained agency, the order was revoked and they were allowed to remain. The Fathers of Picpus, however, belonging to the same congregation, have been sent adrift and their house has been seized and sold by the government.

A curious prophecy that for many years has been current among

the nuns of Picpus seems so far to have been fulfilled. It says that the fathers will have to leave, but that the Sisters, although they will pack and prepare to depart, shall be left in possession of their house.

There are few spots in Paris more impressive than this quiet convent, far away from the noise and turmoil of the great city. In the church, where two white robed nuns kneel night and day before the Blessed Sacrament, are large marble tablets bearing the names of the thirteen hundred persons who were beheaded on the neighboring "place" in the short space of six weeks. All the great names of France are here represented, together with hosts of poor and obscure martyrs—peasants, servants, shopkeepers, sailors and soldiers, and among them the sixteen Carmelites of Compiègne.

Beyond the church, close to the "cimetierè des guillotinés," is the enclosure where the descendants of the victims elected to rest near their beloved dead. The illustrious French families La Rochefoucauld, Montmorency, Noailles, des Cass, Grammont have here their burial place. Among these tombs two will appeal in a special manner to Catholics and to Americans. One is the grave of Montalembert, the great Christian orator and writer, the other that of Lafayette, above which wave the "Stars and Stripes."

Lafayette's noble and holy wife was Adrienne de Noailles, whose mother, sister and grandmother perished on the scaffold five days after the Carmelites. It was in great measure owing to her exertions that the ground adjoining the "cimetierè des guillotinés" was bought and devoted to religious purposes.

One word now of the religious whose absence from Compiègne when the community was arrested deprived her of the martyr's crown. The circumstances that led to her being parted from her Sisters seem truly providential, when we remember that it is owing to her that the story we have just related has been handed down to posterity.

After the fall of Robespierre Sister Mary of the Incarnation set to work to collect all possible evidence on the subject of her martyred companions. At Compiègne she visited the English Benedictines, who were still in prison. In Paris she conversed with persons who had been present at the trial of the nuns and who had seen them on their way to the scaffold. At Orleans the worthy peasant Pierre Blot gave her all the information in his power concerning the Carmelites' stay at the Conciergerie. The Sister, an intelligent, accurate and highly conscientious woman, subsequently retired to the Carmelite convent at Sens, where she died. Her carefully written account of her Sister's heroic death was published by M. Villecourt, afterwards Cardinal, who as vicar general of the

Diocese of Sens had been personally acquainted with Sister Mary of the Incarnation, whom he held in high esteem.

The evidence so zealously collected by one who was the contemporary and friend of the martyrs has served as a groundwork for the official inquiry set on foot by ecclesiastical authorities with a view of obtaining the beatification of the Carmelites of Compiègne. This inquiry was happily completed last year and resulted in a decree by which Pope Pius X. declared that the sixteen nuns were in truth martyrs for the faith.

It was our privilege to be present at St. Peter's on the 27th of May last, when by the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff the Catholic Church laid her seal on the holy lives and heroic deaths of the martyred nuns and proclaimed their right to rank among the "beati," to whom public homage is paid throughout the Catholic world. When the solemn sound of the "Te Deum" rolled through the great basilica our thoughts flew back to the other hymn of praise that the Carmelites sang as they ascended the bloody steps of the scaffold, and remembering the perils that now threaten the Catholics of France, we felt more deeply the imports of to-day's ceremony. It told us that glory is the outcome of pain; that happiness without end or limit is the portion of those who in evil days prove faithful to God and to their conscience. It reminded us, too, that the Master loves a "cheerful giver" such as the sweet-faced, simple-hearted women who went to death as to a feast and whose joyous "Laudate" echoed under the very knife of the guillotine.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

Paris, France.

A FRENCH VIEW OF ENGLISH CATHOLICITY.

I.

"La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIXme Siècle." Par Paul Thureau-Dangin, de l'Académie Française. Trois volumes. Troisième partie, Paris, 1906.

IT IS a difficult and rare achievement to be both able and willing to place oneself in another's intellectual position and to estimate his work, his opinions, his surroundings with insight and with fairness from his own point of view. The difficulty is increased indefinitely when barriers of race and language are added to those of various mental training, circumstances and inherited tradition. It is precisely this difficult achievement, so desirable and so infrequent, that M. Thureau-Dangin appears, in our judgment, to have successfully undertaken. In any case, such a study, written by an

author of literary ability and renown, must have been deeply interesting to Anglo-Saxon readers, especially, of course, to Anglo-Saxon Catholics. But what continually strikes, and indeed surprises, the student of M. Thureau-Dangin's book is the extraordinary sympathy he shows with the English character and with English modes thought and the remarkable grasp of English prejudices which he has managed to make his own. Probably few foreigners have been able to enter so completely into the inner life of another nation.

There is no wonder that the religious side of English life during the last seventy years should arrest the attention and the interest of any student. It is difficult to imagine anything more miserable, dead and scandalous than England's religion, viewed as a whole, at the beginning of that period. The Established Church seemed crumbling to her utter dissolution. Nearly three centuries of triumphant and almost indisputed heresy had ended by robbing her, in practice, of most of those fragments of the faith which even the "Elizabethan Settlement" had left her from the wreckage of the old religion, and on which the High Churchmen of the sixteenth century had vainly tried to found a sort of counter-reformation. In the eyes of the world, and practically by her own confession, she was the mere creature of the civil power. For some eight generations she had burnt incense to Cæsar instead of Christ, and Cæsar had repaid her worship by binding her hand and foot with fetters that she had come to glory in. Her hold on the English people was that of legal claim and the strong arm of the State, of which she seemed as much an official department as the Home or Foreign Office. The nation had never loved her, and the more earnest and devout of her children were, in spite of disabling statutes, continually tending to separate from her communion. She had shown them the way to schism, and how, in the light of that action, had she the logical or moral right to blame them if they learnt the lesson perfectly? With few exceptions the ideal of the best of her clergy was that of an educated gentleman, living a life of ease and refinement, kindly and beneficent to his neighbors, a good judge of horses and of wine, an uncompromising High Tory in politics, well read in some of the pagan classics and profoundly ignorant of the very elements of Christian theology. Those who remember some of the later survivals of this type will agree, we believe, that it was not without a solid worth of its own; but the type was that of a well-meaning, correctly-living layman. Of, alas! too many of the clergy the ideal was something immensely lower. It is unnecessary to paint the picture, one all too common, of the dissolute, intemperate, utterly slothful and careless parson of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

And yet this Establishment held by English law the monopoly of the spiritual rights of the English nation! In theory every English subject was a follower of her creed and a communicant at her altars; in practice the services, the liberal professions, the universities, parliamentary and municipal life were closed to all who avowed themselves dissenters from the State religion. Such abominable enactments as the "Test Act" at once deprived law-abiding Englishmen of the rights of English citizenship, put a premium on hypocrisy and sacrilege and made the Establishment hated by a large proportion of the people. It was only in 1828 that the Corporation and Test Acts were wiped off the statute book.

The condition of English Catholics at this period has often been described, notably in Mr. Ward's "Life of Cardinal Wiseman." They were, in the words of Mr. Purcell,[1] "a scattered remnant of a mighty people that had filled the land from sea to sea." Cardinal Newman, with his unfailing touch of deep and eloquent pathos, has told how they appeared to "a boy's curious eyes" in his childhood:

"No longer the Catholic Church in the country; nay, no longer a Catholic community, but a few adherents of the old religion, moving silently and sorrowfully about as memorials of what had been, . . . a mere handful of individuals who might be counted like the pebbles and detritus of the great deluge."[2]

To the eyes of the world there was as yet no sign of the coming of "The Second Spring." Various partial measures of relief had recently culminated in the Catholic Emancipation Act, passed by an unwilling government under the pressure of circumstances rather than from any sentiment of justice or love of liberty, in 1829. As Sir T. Erskine May (whose writings show neither intimate knowledge of nor any real sympathy with the Catholic faith) writes in his fascinating "Constitutional History of England:"[3] "At length this great measure of toleration and justice was accomplished. But the concession came too late. Accompanied by one measure of repression[4] and another of disfranchisement,[5] it was wrung by violence from reluctant and unfriendly rulers." We may well take exception to part of the last sentence, but there is enough of truth in it, in view of the state of feeling in Ireland at the time, to justify a Protestant writer in its use. "Violence" was dreaded by the government—an exasperated and downtrodden people will turn at last—but no violence had been attempted.

In another way, too, "the concession came too late." Not too late,

[1] "Life of Cardinal Manning," Vol. II., p. 641.
[2] "Occasional Sermons," p. 172.
[3] Vol. III., p. 175.
[4] An act suppressing the "Catholic Association" of Ireland.
[5] The Irish Franchise Act of 1829.

indeed, for the revival and eventual triumph of the Church, but too late for many of her children's spiritual welfare. The penal laws had done their diabolical work only too effectually. As in the days of Henry and Elizabeth, and later still, unnumbered thousands had stifled their deepest convictions and thrown aside their best and dearest treasure in view of the rack and the halter, the knife and the cauldron; so, as the generations went by, men whose fathers had faced martyrdom, poverty and exile lost heart and courage and, despairing of better things, submitted to the State-made and State-upheld religion, the profession of which at once opened to them all possible honors and emoluments. The bitterness to a patriotic Englishman (as to any other loyal son of his fatherland) of finding himself cut off from his country's service must have been such as to pierce to his very soul. And so there were thousands who, without any real change of conviction, accepted the established order of things and gave over a Catholic family to the heresy and schism which in their hearts they detested and despised. Again, the penal laws had made the shepherding of the faithful a physical impossibility, except to a limited degree. The heroism and splendid charity of our priests in those dark days can never be exaggerated; their story is written in the eternal records and in the brave lives, the patience and the perseverance of those to whom they ministered. But there were not and could not be sufficient men for the work. If the act of 1829 had come half a century earlier, the whole history of the Catholic Revival would probably have run in a different channel. There would have been to-day in England many thousands more of hereditary Catholics; but the "heroic age"[6] of the Revival—coinciding with the career of the three great English Cardinals, Wiseman, Newman, Manning—could scarcely have been what it was, and there might have been many thousands less of converts.

The "Renaissance Catholique," as M. Thureau-Dangin points out, naturally forms a history with two distinct currents of life and thought. On the one hand it is the uplifting once more of the ancient Church—the winning back, step by step, through frequent disappointment and patient struggle, a place and an influence in that life of England that was once all her own—the restoration, not yet indeed to her rightful throne, but to something of her former sway, of the discrowned Queen. On the other hand, it is the marvelous and all unlooked for revival of Catholic thought and instinct, inchoate and necessarily imperfect as it was, in the Anglican Church. When the worst seemed to have come to her, there arose a craving and a sense of loss which led the best and most devout of her members to

[6] M. Thureau-Dangin's expression.

ask if there were not some better foundation for their creed and their ecclesiastical life than the State connection which had proved so intolerable a burden and so rotten a support. Anglican churchmen began to look backwards to the old faith of England and to ask whether they might not find there the satisfaction of their wants and a basis on which to rest their belief and their position. They looked out on Christendom and asked why it was that a small island in the North Atlantic should have arrogated to itself a position of spiritual as well as geographical insularity. There was no thought as yet of the position of the communion to which they belonged being in itself hopelessly unsound. When Keble, on July 14, 1833, preached his famous Assize sermon on "National Apostasy," when, on September 9 following, the first of the Tracts for the Times appeared, and throughout the seven years signalized by their successive appearance the endeavor and the hope of the leaders of the "Oxford Movement" was to restore to Anglicanism, as a practical system, what they were wholly convinced belonged to her *in posse*. She had but disused her supernatural powers; her children had forgotten much of her unquestionable teaching; through deplorable circumstances, that happily did not touch her essential life, she had drifted into a position of separation which it must be her children's aim and prayer to terminate. This was the theory on which the movement depended for its very life. When it was shattered, in the face of inexorable history and hard facts of the present day, but one path was left—that of submission to the authority of the One Universal Church.

There were two other streams of thought and action no less marked out than the "Tractarian" school from the typical Anglican parson of the early nineteenth century. The Evangelicals still numbered a large following, though the zenith of their influence was passed, and the decadence of the party had set in rapidly. Several high ecclesiastical positions were still held, and some would be held for many years, by members of the party, but already, as the outstanding active influence within the Anglican Church, its work was done. Another school was just rising into prominence and numbered amongst its disciples some of the most intellectual and ardent spirits of the time. It was known as the "Liberal," later as "Broad Church" party, and its first leaders were Whately, fellow of Oriel, afterwards principal of Alban Hall and Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, and Arnold, who in 1827 had been appointed head master of Rugby. This school also dreamt of a revival, the foundation of which was to be an intellectual but undogmatic piety; disdainful alike of High Churchmen and Evangelicals, it nevertheless had nothing about it of the arid unbelief of the eighteenth century. It sought to express itself by social as well as intellectual activity, and had con-

siderable influence on a limited section of contemporary English thought. The Lutheran-latitudinarian element introduced into the court by Queen Victoria's marriage to Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg naturally found sympathy and sought alliance with this school, and this led to the promotion of some of its members, notably Arthur P. Stanley, who was chosen to be the Prince of Wales' traveling tutor and was appointed Dean of Westminster. But as a party its career was short, if brilliant, and it is represented to-day by scattered individuals, rather than by a school, in the Anglican Church.

M. Thureau-Dangin gives in his opening chapter an admirable picture of the relations of these various elements, to which we have briefly referred, at the period when the "Oxford Movement" began its course. He traces the antecedents of the first leaders and relates how they came into touch with each other. They formed, indeed, a wonderful group, those men who set themselves to stem the liberalizing tendency of the day, who declared themselves the adherents of a tradition that was well-nigh forgotten and which the dignitaries of the Established Church, with few exceptions, regarded as certainly dead and, so far as they could see, comfortably buried. Keble, Newman and Froude were, all Oxford knew, three of the most brilliant of her sons. Pusey, who joined the movement somewhat later, and who occupied, as professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church, a more prominent position in the university than the others, was known as a man of stupedous learning and as a student of the rationalizing German theology which was still a closed book to most English readers. He had gone abroad for the express purpose of learning on its own ground what that system really was, its strength and its weakness and how Christianity could best repel its attacks. With these leaders were associated other friends, such as Hugh James Rose, Arthur Perceval and William Palmer, in general sympathy with the principles of at least the earlier Tracts, but possessed by a spirit of intense caution and conservatism that feared to shock the dominant Protestantism and the inert, self-satisfied respectability of the Anglican fold. If their counsel had been followed, it is scarcely too much to say that the history of the last seventy years would need to be rewritten.

The movement, however, in spite of the outspoken hatred of Puritanism expressed by Hurrell Froude and shared by some of the younger followers of the revival, was entirely and intrinsically Anglican in its methods and its aim. The vicar of St. Mary's (Newman had filled this post since 1828) designed to awaken the Church of England to a sense of her dormant capacities and her lost traditions. He and his colleagues looked back to the seventeenth century, with its famous Anglican theologians, who for the first time since

the break with the old religion (Hooker only excepted) strove after a constructive system of theology rather than laborious briefs against the Catholic faith. The earlier Tracts were full of attacks on the Catholic Church, which was declared to be "incurable, malicious, cruel, pestilential, heretical, monstrous, blasphemous;" she was said to have apostatized at the Council of Trent, and fear was expressed that the whole Roman communion was bound to Antichrist by a perpetual compact! Froude blamed this violence, and Newman acknowledged that such language was violent and declamatory, but maintained that he really believed what he wrote, and that such protests were necessary to the position of the Anglican Church and conformable to the tradition of all her theologians.

It was obvious that Anglican practice was in phenomenal contradiction to the Anglican formularies. It is so to-day, but not in the same extraordinary degree. Seventy years ago, for the great majority of the clergy, for almost the whole of the laity, such truths as the regenerating grace of holy baptism, the benefit of sacramental confession and of penitential exercise, the power of the keys as exercised in absolution, though plain enough in the pages of the Book of Common Prayer, were either utterly ignored or were indignantly and contemptuously denied. Such practices as the observance of holidays, the daily recitation of the prayer book offices, the keeping of Lent and other fast days, the Friday abstinence, though expressly commanded, shared the same fate. To-day there are many who try to be loyal to these doctrines and practices in the Church of England. But they are still, alas! in opposition to the general trend of Anglicanism, and it may be said with a good deal of truth that the more loyal a man is to his profession of prayer book religion, the more he will be treated as a traitor and a renegade by those in authority. So impotent is truth when it merely exists on paper, so ineffectual the best of rules when there is no Living Voice behind them.

The hero of M. Thureau-Dangin's work is not only in his account of the Oxford Movement, but throughout his three volumes, John Henry Newman. The movement was what it was because Newman was its real, if unacknowledged, leader. Keble had retired to his country parish in Hampshire and was seldom in Oxford. Pusey, who was afterwards recognized as leader, was essentially a university professor and an ecclesiastical dignitary; reverenced in the highest degree, he did not possess the personal fascination nor the intellectual splendor, marvelous both for its agility and its strength, that characterized the vicar of St. Mary's. Pusey was a man of immense gifts as well as of deep piety, but Newman was one of those souls lit with the fire of genius, of whom but very few are

granted to each generation. Not England alone—not even the English-speaking race alone—but the educated world knows to-day that among the mightiest—on the very heights of Olympus—John Henry Newman has not the least or the lowest place.

The tremendous force of his sermons—a force that owed nothing to oratorical declamation or conventional pulpit action, but was simply the result of the preacher's own moral and spiritual being acting on the hearts and consciences of his hearers—is dealt with by our author with the most complete appreciation and discernment. The theme is not a new one to English readers, but it is one that never tires. The intense quiet of the preacher, the wonderful pathos of his voice, the absolutely simple yet masterly language in which every thought was clothed and which even in his young manhood proclaimed Newman one of the great masters of the English tongue—more than all, the thrilling reality of both the man and his words—have often been described by none more feelingly and eloquently than by Newman's early and unfailing friend, Dean Church. And, as is the case with his other writings, Newman's sermons have during the last ten years attracted, in a way altogether new, the attention and the admiration of various French writers. As long ago as 1897 his preaching formed the subject of an interesting article by P. Brémond in the *Etudes Religieuses,* while six of the "University Sermons" have lately been published in a translation by M. Saleilles, an introduction being provided by the Abbé Dimmet, himself a keen student of English religious life and a writer on the subject.

The story of the Hampden controversy, the appearance on the scene of English life of Dr. Wiseman, then rector of the Collegio Inglese in Rome, the rapid growth of adherents to the movement, including such names as Oakeley, Marriott, W. G. Ward, Church, F. W. Faber, Hope-Scott and (though by no means unreservedly) Manning, are admirably told in the chapter entitled "L'Apogée du Mouvement." It seemed as if the Anglo-Catholic school were to carry all before it. Not alone at Oxford, but in the sister university in London and in the provinces generally what were known by friends as "Apostolical," by enemies as "Tractarian," principles were making way. Newman himself, in the "Apologia,"[7] states: "In the spring of 1839 my position in the Anglican Church was at its height. I had supreme confidence in my controversial *status,* and I had a great and still growing success in recommending it to others." He refers to an article in the *British Critic* for April, 1839, as containing, though he "little knew it at the time," " the last words which

[7] P. 180, original edition.
[8] "Apologia," p. 182.

I ever spoke as an Anglican to Anglicans."[8] For the great leader was on the point, unknown to himself, of recognizing the impossibility of maintaining the solidity of that Via Media in which he believed himself to have found, and which he had pointed out to others as furnishing a sound basis for the Anglican position as distinguished from what he termed respectively "Roman corruption" and "Protestantism" or "Ultra-Protestantism." In the long vacation of that year he "began to study and master the history of the Monophysites. . . . It was during this course of reading that for the first time a doubt came upon me of the tenableness of Anglicanism."[9] And though he sought, and for a time believed he had found, a more secure foundation for the Via Media, it was henceforth, however unconscious he might be of the fact, but a question of time before this doubt should deepen into absolute distrust. Still his whole longing was to find a resting place which could satisfy his understanding and his conscience in the communion that was so dear to him and which he had served so faithfully. All that he could do, besides, to restrain others from submission to the Catholic Church he did with earnestness and vigor. This was the motive of the publication, on February 27, 1841, of the famous Tract XC. To retrace the storm of controversy that immediately broke out would not be desirable, even if it were possible, in this place. Oxford and England have been ashamed of it for two generations. And the principle of interpretation which it applies to the "Thirty-nine Articles of Religion" is to-day a commonplace amongst probably half of the Anglican clergy. In these day, in fact, it seems so evident that we wonder at the intellectual position of the heads of houses, tutors and Bishops, whom it threw into a state of such strange excitement.

The story of the censure passed on the Tract and of the subsequent events is well known and is told well and sympathetically by M. Thureau-Dangin. He has entered in a remarkable degree into the attitude, not only of the great leader, but of the other actors in those long-past scenes. One point that he develops with especial interest is the line taken by Dr. Wiseman, now become Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District, with the title of Bishop of Melepotamus. It was no doubt natural that the old hereditary Catholics of England should look with suspicion on the movement within the Anglican Church. They remembered how, under Laud's primacy, there had been an apparent drawing towards the Catholic Church of many within the Established communion, and how the hopes then raised had crumbled in utter disappointment. The long era of persecution had so depressed the faithful remnant that they even shrank

[9] P. 208.

from the coming of converts into the Church, lest the new element should be one of danger and disquiet. Mgr. Wiseman, trained in the free atmosphere of Rome, where the Church was able to live her life unchecked and to manifest her Divine strength, shared none of these fears and suspicions. He watched with deepest interest and with undismayed, albeit patient, hope the struggles that were leading so much of what was noblest and best in Anglicanism to the threshold of the Church. He was able to gauge, and not afraid to confess, the superiority, in all things but the possession of the truth and communion with the true Church, of these men to the Catholic clergy, to whom the benefits of an English university training and the stimulus of taking part in England's social and intellectual life had so long been denied. In a "Letter to Lord Shrewsbury," which became justly celebrated, Wiseman treated the question of the religious crisis in England with a sympathy and a delicacy all his own. He protested against all bitterness and uncharity on the part of the hereditary Catholics; he showed a wonderful appreciation of the good faith, the piety and the gifts of the Oxford leaders. In fine, his letter was in all respects worthy of a Christian Bishop, and we do not wonder that our author writes in comment:

"Pour Newman et ses amis, il y aurait eu certes plus d'une réflexion à faire sur le contraste entre le ton dont parlait d'eux cet évêque catholique et le langage qu'à cette même époque leur tenaient leurs propres évêques." The unmeasured, and often coarse and disgraceful, condemnations passed upon the "Tractarians" in nearly all the (Anglican) Episcopal charges of the day might well make Newman exclaim to Pusey: "We have leant upon the Bishops, and they have broken down under us."

It would take too long to follow the account, as given by M. Thureau-Dangin, of the retreat of Newman to Littlemore, his long months of waiting there, surrounded by some of his most ardent disciples; the storm raised by the publications of Ward's "Ideal of a Christian Church" and his condemnation by convocation; the dramatic scene at the same convocation when the "Nobis procuratoribus non placet" of Guillemard and Church alone stayed the proposal of the vote condemning Tract XC. and, by implication, Newman, his teaching and his work. No one has described this scene more effectively than Dean Church in that simple, because so intensely scholarly, English of which he was a past master.

The closing chapter of M. Thureau-Dangin's book is aptly entitled "Le Dénouement." The long retreat at Littlemore was indeed leading up to one of the greatest and most far-reaching results that could be conceived for the Anglican Church. Two years had passed since Newman had preached (on September 25, 1843) his

last Anglican sermon at Littlemore—that famous, wonderful, eloquent, pathetic "Parting of Friends" which so long as the English tongue shall endure will be reckoned as one of the greatest of English sermons. A man who can read it without emotion is scarcely to be reckoned a deep-thinking Christian or a true Englishman. Its burning words of terrible disillusionment, of touching appeal, brand with eternal shame the Anglican Church of those days. Her rulers, case-hardened in their ignorance and prejudice, the slaves of an evil tradition, had not had the eyes or the hearts to recognize her noblest son.

The world-renowned "Apologia pro Vita sua" has made all readers familiar with the thoughts and aims of Newman during this time of retreat. He was, in the first place, forcing to a decision, however long might be the time before he attained to this point, the doubts and perplexities which had so long assailed him. Besides this, he was providing a shelter for younger men who themselves were perplexed and undecided as to their duty in religious matters. He used all his influence to hinder them from taking the serious step of submission to the Catholic Church, at least without long reflection sustained and directed by a life of discipline and devotion. If he could by any means have found a way to reconcile his conscience, the voice of history, the testimony of all Christian times and his position in the Anglican Church, with what unspeakable relief—with what triumphant joy, indeed—would he not have remained at his post and restrained by his effectual influence any movement on the part of his disciples!

Toward the end of the winter of 1844-5 (M. Thureau-Dangin's phrase "a la fin de l'hiver de 1845" is somewhat misleading) Newman, ever loyal to his friends, began to tell them frankly that his reception into the Church could be only a matter of time. He was working hard at the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," devoting many hours each day to its composition. The motto on the title page of this, his last Anglican (in a sense, his first Catholic) work is full of pathos and significance, not only in relation to this particular volume, but when applied to the whole religious character and career of the author, and in a special degree to these long months of anxious waiting and searching for the light: "Oculi mei defecerunt in salutare Tuum." The essay was written, as he tells us, "not in the first instance to prove the divinity of the Catholic religion, though ultimately they furnish a positive argument in its behalf, but to explain certain difficulties in its history, felt before now by the author himself, and commonly insisted on by Protestants in controversy as serving to blunt the force of its *primâ facie* and general claims on our recognition."[10] On October

[10] Preface to the edition of 1878.

6 Newman penned the last lines of his essay, the composition of which had been the final means of bringing his last doubts and hesitations to an end. "As I advanced, my view so cleared that instead of speaking any more of 'the Roman Catholics,' I boldly called them Catholics. Before I got to the end I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it was then, unfinished."[11]

Two days later John Henry Newman was received into the Catholic Church. Many years before, in the great monastery of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, on the Cœlian Hill, Fr. Dominic, one of the sons of S. Paul of the Cross, filled with the spirit of the Founder, in whose great heart England ever found so dear a place, was told (as he ever believed, and as his whole society bear witness) as he prayed before a venerable picture of Our Lady, that one day his work would lie in that northern land where heresy and schism seemed all triumphant. Long years passed, and at length the community found it possible to send a mission to England, but another father was chosen to be its head, and the monk to whom the promise was made was not even included in the chosen number. Almost on the eve of their setting out the appointed leader found himself, through ill health, unable to leave his monastery, and, utterly contrary to all expectation, the superior, sending for Fr. Dominic, named him as the head of the mission. How little the Passionist Father, as he found his dream thirty years fulfilled, knew that he was to be the chosen instrument of reconciling the foremost ecclesiastic of the Anglican Church to the Rock of Peter and the City of the Saints!

Dean Church—than whom none bears a more deservedly revered name in the records of Anglicanism—may well, writing of course from the Anglican standpoint, entitle the last chapter of his "Oxford Movement" (the best and fairest of all the many histories of the revival) "The Catastrophe." Gladstone may well have said that the reconciliation of Newman was the greatest victory the Church of Rome had gained since the (so-called) Reformation. With it ends the first chapter of the "Anglo-Catholic" revival and the first volume of M. Thureau-Dangin's book.

II.

It seemed for a moment as if the movement was wrecked and as if the Liberalism, against which it was the protest, were to win all along the line. Certainly the Oxford of the next decade differed widely from the Oxford of the palmy days of the movement. The "Tractarians" were no longer the supreme religious force of the

[11] "Apologia," p. 366.

university; for a while the growing Broad Church school was the most evident, and in a limited sense the most influential. During these years, also, a series of disasters came upon the Anglican Church which affected chiefly, but by no means solely, its High Church section. In 1846 an old trouble was revived. The absurd and offensive "Jerusalem Bishopric" scheme, which at its inception five years before had no small effect in opening Newman's eyes to the realities of Anglicanism, took a still more unhappy turn. According to the extraordinary arrangement of this ecclesiastical *bêtise,* the King of Prussia had the alternate nomination to this titular "see," and now designated a Mr. Gobat, formerly a Lutheran minister, now an Anglican deacon, as his choice. This gentleman had published a book suspected of heresy on the doctrine of Our Lord's Incarnation (whether in a Nestorian or Eutychian direction does not clearly appear), and in other respects was scarcely a likely person to represent Anglican interests in the Holy City satisfactorily. The most earnest protests were made by the Bishop of Exeter, Pusey, Church, Marriott and others, but all to no purpose, and Mr. Gobat went to Jerusalem. But his administration was the end of the arrangement; Anglican feeling was too strong, and the English and Prussian Governments cared too little about the scheme for another appointment. There is to-day an Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, but he is there under completely different conditions and represents no longer the Protestantism—the Anglican-Lutheran alliance—of sixty years ago, but the Anglican communion in its distinctly High Church aspect.

The second scandal, in the following year, was the nomination of Dr. Hampden, whose appointment to the regius professorship of divinity eleven years before had caused a storm of protest and denunciation on the part of both Tractarians and Evangelicals to the See of Hereford.

Lord John Russell, then Premier, was delighted to have this opportunity of at once hindering the revival of the Church of England, scandalizing her most loyal and fervent members and emphasizing her complete bondage to the State. It was an insult of a grave character, against which even a number of Broad Churchmen protested Thirteen Bishops presented a joint remonstrance to the Minister; others wrote privately to express their disapprobation. The Dean of Hereford, with two of his chapter, refused to obey the "congé d'élire;" the protesting laymen at the "confirmation" in Bow Church, who appeared in answer to the invitation given to all to state any cause against an episcopal appointment, were told that they could not be heard. All was in vain. Hampden was consecrated on March 26, 1848, and thenceforth sunk into obscurity.

Lord John Russell went on his way triumphantly. Once more the rulers of Anglicanism had failed their people. The men who claimed to bear Christ's awful pastoral staff had bowed again to Cæsar.

Yet another blow was to shake in innumerable minds their confidence in Anglicanism. The notorious "Gorham case" began in 1847, when the Bishop of Exeter refused institution to the clergyman of that name on the ground of his rejection of the Catholic doctrine of holy baptism, on which, at least, the Anglican formularies are uncompromisingly orthodox. The Court of Arches sustained the Bishop's action, but on March 8, 1850, this decision was quashed by the judgment of the judicial committee of the Privy Council, to which Mr. Gorham had appealed. The excitement was tremendous throughout the country. The Bishop of Exeter, in his famous letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, avowed his intention of breaking off communion with any one pretending to give mission to Mr. Gorham in his diocese; the letter had reached its fourth edition by the evening of the day of its publication. Lord Selborne (then Sir Roundell Palmer), Gladstone, Pusey, Keble, all the best of clergy and laity in the Establishment, entered their protest in the strongest terms. Meetings were held, addresses presented, an attempt made to modify the jurisdiction of the Privy Council by a bill introduced into the House of Lords by the Bishop of London. Once more all was futile. The government were determined to force the supremacy of the Crown (or rather, as it had now become, the supremacy of Parliament) on the consciences of Englishmen, as had been so often done before. With regard to the fate of this bill, defeated by 84 against 51 votes, M. Thureau-Dangin excellently notes: "Détail significatif: quatre évêques seulement ont voté pour; les autres, y compris l'archevêque de Canterbury, se sont abstenus." And Mr. Gorham was instituted under a fiat of the Primate, in spite of the Bishop of Exeter's renewed and most solemn declaration that he would repudiate communion with the institutor. The smoke of the incense went up in clouds once more—before the idol of Cæsar. Poor England! these were the chains her tyrants forged for her children when they broke away from obedience to the Vicar of Christ. A hard exchange, truly.

It is characteristic of Anglicanism that when some great scandal occurs or some fresh wrong is perpetrated on the part of the civil power, intense excitement blazes for a while—meetings are held, petitions and declarations circulated and signed by thousands, eloquent speeches are made by the very flower of her clergy and laity, resistance *a l'outrance* is proclaimed—and then, one scarcely knows when or how, though the scandal is not removed nor the wrong

repaired, all is quiet again. New arguments have been found why the resistance should not be uncompromising, and so things settle down until the next strain upon those bonds which so often seem upon the point of breaking, and which most assuredly will break some day.

The Catholic Church was, inevitably, the haven to which many of the distressed sons and daughters of the Anglican body turned in those times of distress, 1847-50, to which we have referred. By this time the movement, which had seemed almost destroyed in 1845, had developed new energy and, under changed conditions, was stronger than before. Oxford was no longer its home or centre. It had spread throughout the country, and was every day permeating all that was most active and most devout in the Established Church. One of the most conspicuous figures in the revival was now Henry Edward Manning, Archdeacon of Chichester and rector of Lavington. An evangelical by training, during his early clerical years he was looked on as the rising hope of the Puritan section of Anglicanism, which was rapidly waning in numbers and influence. He gradually, however, came to embrace the wider and more historical theology of the Tractarian leaders, but never thoroughly attached himself to their school. He was, by temper and conviction, an administrator far more than a theologian; and he was persuaded that the interests of his Church demanded a moderate policy in all things. No ecclesiastic of his time was more popular in London society; and yet it would be a grievous wrong to Manning to imagine that, even as an Anglican dignitary, he belonged to the worldly type of parson then so prevalent. His piety was deep and intensely real, and his personal life simple to asceticism. For years his effort was to keep back from submission the many souls under his spiritual guidance who were distressed and shaken by the scandals and apparent helplessness of Anglicanism. In fact, his anti-Roman zeal made a serious division between him and Dr. Pusey and other leaders of the movement. This zeal manifested itself in his archidiaconal utterances, and most remarkably in a university sermon preached on "Gunpowder Plot" day—a feast appointed by the State and provided with an office bound up usually with the Anglican prayer books of those days. It is only just to add that the Anglican Church had never given authority to either the festival or the prescribed service. Both fell into desuetude and were abolished by an order in Council in 1859.

The Gorham judgment was to Manning and many others the last straw that broke their confidence in their ecclesiastical position; or, rather, the fact that the judgment was met by no effectual repudiation on the part of the Church. Others went before him, such as

his brother-in-law, Henry Wilberforce, Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Markell, Mr. Serjeant Bellasis and Mr. Allies. Manning, with his dear friend Hope-Scott, followed them after a long struggle. On Passion Sunday, April 6, 1851, he was received into the Church by Fr. Brownbill, S. J. The following Sunday, at St. George's Pro-Cathedral, Southwark, he received not only the Sacrament of Confirmation and Holy Communion at the hands of Cardinal Wiseman, but also the tonsure. The minor orders, sub-diaconate and diaconate, followed quickly, and on Trinity Sunday, June 15, he was ordained priest by the Cardinal. It was but ten weeks from his reception, and the Cardinal was subjected to a good deal of severe criticism in consequence; but Wiseman, "large-hearted and sympathetic," as Mr. Purcell well terms him,[12] knew his convert, and knew, too, the mind of Rome, and had obtained express sanction for his unusual action.

It is necessary to glance back a few months from Manning's conversion to an event of profound significance to the Catholic Church in England, and which roused the ignorant Puritanism of the country into a fever heat as ignominious as it was disgraceful. For some years the question of the reëstablishment of the hierarchy had been debated in Rome; the timidity of the hereditary Catholics had been alarmed, but the Holy See knew that the time was come, and on September 29, 1850, Pius IX. published the brief restoring the hierarchy in England and creating an archbishopric with twelve suffragan sees. In the consistory of the following day Wiseman, then in Rome, was created Cardinal. He had already been nominated Archbishop of Westminster and metropolitan. On October 7 the Cardinal-Archbishop announced the news in a pastoral letter dated "From without the Flaminian Gate," according to the well-known rule which prohibits Bishops, when in Rome, from addressing their dioceses as from *within* the city—a privilege which belongs alone to the Holy Father as Bishop of Rome. It is amusing, but humiliating to an Englishman, to read the story of the Protestant tempest that broke out. Lord John Russell had the stupid insolence, which only made the Minister ridiculous, to threaten to stop the Cardinal from landing on English shores! The *Times,* of course, outdid itself in ignorant declamation and foolish abuse that could hurt only the paper or its Puritan readers. The Premier's "Letter to the Bishop of Durham," too long to quote here, was an example of all that a responsible Minister of the Crown, or a man claiming the name and manners of a gentleman, should have been ashamed to write. The popular clamor, thus roused and encouraged, became deafening. Any society but the Church of God must have trembled under the

[12] "Life of Manning," Vol. I., p. 628.

storm of calumny, lying and blasphemy. But the great Cardinal was unmoved, and his "Appeal to the English People," published a few days after his return to London on November 11, brought back to sanity all that was capable of such a return. The good feeling and the good sense of the country recognized and rendered homage to the loyalty both to the truth and to his country, the intellectual power, the logical reasoning and the unfailing courtesy of the Cardinal-Archbishop, who followed up this marvelous success with a course of lectures at St. George's Pro-Cathedral, to which men of all creeds, or of none, came in crowds.

The tide was turned. Mr. Disraeli, on the conservative side of politics, Mr. Roebuck on the liberal, raised their protest against the Prime Minister's infamous "Letter." Mr. Roebuck's words, which M. Thureau-Dangin gives in a translation which preserves the fire and clear eloquence of the original, were worthy of a man who was known throughout England as one who, without thought of his own interests, lived his political life simply for the liberty and the good of his countrymen. When the member of Sheffield died, many years afterwards, it was felt that a force that made continually for political purity and unselfishness had been lost to England.

The government, nevertheless, persuaded Parliament to pass the worse than absurd "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill," prohibiting under severe penalties the appropriation of any territorial designation by any Bishop but those of the Establishment. The measure was born dead, was never put in force, and twenty years later, Mr. Gladstone being Premier, was wiped off the statute book almost without notice. The episode, however, did not tend to enhance the dignity of the "Mother of Parliaments."

It might well have been expected that this anti-Papal outburst would have retarded the progress of the High Church revival in the Anglican communion. The "Durham Letter" had attacked the followers of the movement with even greater bitterness and more unmeasured abuse than had been showered on the Catholics themselves. The Anglican Bishops, too, were unrelenting in their antagonism, with but few exceptions. The foremost member of the episcopate was Samuel Wilberforce, who for some years had been Bishop of Oxford. A man of great administrative and oratorical gifts, of strong ambition and possessing a large measure of influence at court and among the leading social and political powers of the day, he was looked upon generally as the outstanding representative of Anglican principles of the "moderate High Church" school. He most undoubtedly helped the progress of the movement; his diocesan administration was, in its fairness to all, a happy contrast to the management of some other dioceses. He had a strong sense of the

rightful freedom and spiritual independence which are the Church's heritage, and he believed most intensely in the position and the prospects of Anglicanism. His life-long antagonist on the episcopal bench was, naturally, Archibald Campbell Tait, nominated Bishop of London in 1856 and translated to Canterbury in 1868. Tait was of Scottish and Presbyterian origin and had been brought up in the evangelical theology, of which, however, he was neither admirer nor defender. His sympathies were with the Broad Church party, but he was certainly no latitudinarian with regard to the fundamental articles of the faith. But what was above all characteristic of the man and his administration was the most intense, undisguised Erastianism. He had no conception of the Church as a spiritual society; he leant, for the well-being of Anglicanism, on the royal supremacy and the omnipotence of Parliament. At the same time his personal piety was unquestioned. Amid the troubled waters in which the Anglican then, as now, found herself tossing, Tait was scarcely the man to pilot her to safety; but in view of the origin of the Anglican schism and the history of its relation to the civil power, it would be hard to say that he had not most correctly gauged its spirit. Anglicanism is the child of the State; Erastianism is its official atmosphere, and only one act can deliver it from that evil possession. All history and the state of the world to-day tell us that the choice lies between that bondage and submission to the Chair of Peter.

Wilberforce undoubtedly brought a new spirit into the relations between an Anglican Bishop and his clergy, and gave his communion a new ideal of episcopal work and administration. But it would be an utter mistake to imagine that he had any real theological sympathy with the "Anglo-Catholic" section of the clergy and laity. He was dominated by an extraordinary hatred of all that savored of Rome, and many of his utterances, especially in his later life, rather suggest an irresponsible Protestant firebrand than the dignity of a great prelate. It was, besides, very difficult to know how far one could be sure of his action in any given matter. In the appointment, *e. g.,* of Dr. Hampden to Hereford, he at first was an ardent leader of the protesting High Churchmen and Evangelicals, but just when the real difficulty came he followed the will of the court and the government. In the diocesan theological college he founded at Cuddesdon, near Oxford, he encouraged the practice of sacramental confession, but his public utterances in an opposite sense were vehement and declamatory to a degree. It is not for us to judge any man, and Wilberforce on many counts will always deserve the gratitude of the Anglican communion. But we do not wonder that M. Thureau-Dangin, who finds matter for admiration in men of the

most opposite characters and opinions, well—does not include the Bishop among his heroes.

An excellent account is given of the troubles of St. Saviour's, Leeds, founded by Pusey; of the partly successful resuscitation of the two provincial convocations through the energy of Bishop Wilberforce, and of the trials of Archdeacon Denison and Bishop Alexander Forbes of Brechin on the charge of teaching Eucharistic doctrine contrary to the Anglican formularies. Nothing seemed to hinder the progress of the revival. One great cause, no doubt, of the utter failure of the Bishops to stay its course was the growing distrust in which their lordships were held by both clergy and laity. It was a terrible scandal to the religious feeling of England—and it is not forgotten yet—when in 1857 a number of the Bishops, including the Primate and Tait, voted for the iniquitous law that still disgraces the English statute book, which authorized divorce *and the religious "remarriage" of divorced persons,* and which compelled an Anglican clergyman, in spite of his convictions, to allow his church to be used for such sacrilege. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, and Wilberforce, in the Upper House, to their eternal honor, vindicated, though unsuccessfully, the unalterable claims of the Christian moral law. And yet the Bishops who voted with the majority were men who ventured to lay down what they conceived to be the "true doctrine of the Church of England," and to condemn for supposed lack of conformity thereto men such as Pusey, Keble, Denison and W. J. E. Bennett! Truly the City of Confusion is a sad dwelling place.

J. Faber-Scholfield.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Ph. D., LL. D., Edward A. Pace, Ph. D., D. D., Conde B. Pallen, Ph. D., LL. D., Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., John J. Wynne, S. J., assisted by numerous collaborators. In fifteen volumes. Vol. I. Royal octavo, pp. 826, with maps and illustrations. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

The appearance of the first volume of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" marks an epoch in book making in this country. From the beginning the need of such a work was felt. As the Catholic Church grew and spread throughout the country, the need became more pressing and was not confined to Catholics only, because as the organization increased in number and importance it compelled the attention of the non-Catholic public in such a way as to create demands for knowledge concerning its history, doctrine, ceremonial and discipline. The increase of literature in general, and especially of non-Catholic church literature, emphasized the need. The publication of detached volumes on various questions of interest in the Catholic Church from time to time by no means supplied it. Such detached treatises lacked the unity and cohesiveness necessary for a comprehensive view of the whole subject. Only those who were best fitted for study and best disposed to seek information could cover the whole field and find an answer to the questions which were constantly arising. Thinking men in the Church, and out of it, too, agreed that a comprehensive work on Catholic subjects is imperatively necessary for the right understanding of the Church by Catholics themselves as well as by Protestants, Jews and non-believers. In making this statement we do not detract in the least from the faithfulness of churchmen in teaching their congregations. In Catholic countries with parishes rightly arranged and equipped and the discipline of the Church rigidly carried out, nothing more would be required than the spoken word, but taking into consideration all the conditions of modern times, especially in non-Catholic countries, we must admit that something more is needed.

With this thought in mind, the founders of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" banded themselves together and formed an organization which has done phenomenal work, considering all the difficulties in the way. It must be remembered that, for various reasons, Catholic literature in this country, or perhaps we might more truthfully say in the English tongue, has not made as rapid strides as we wish. We are stating the case mildly. An illustration of this truth is found in the fact that no English Catholic publisher in the world

has had the enterprise or the will or the means to get out a Catholic Encyclopedia. In striking contrast to this state of affairs is the action of a publishing house in the United States which brought out a "Jewish Encyclopedia" at an enormous expenditure without any outside aid, as far as is known. We repeat, then, that the editors of this work, who are not capitalists at all, and who had the courage to undertake so great a task in the face of the enormous difficulties which stood in their way, have placed the English-speaking world under an obligation to them which it will never discharge.

One of the most remarkable things about the first volume of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" is that it needs no apology. If it were only passably good, we should feel inclined to praise it unstintedly, but it is as nearly perfect as a work of the kind can be, and therefore without any violation of conscience whatever we congratulate the editors, the publishers, the collaborators, the stockholders and the advance subscribers for giving the first volume of this monumental work to the English-speaking world.

They made a promise in the beginning which was very difficult of fulfillment. They proposed to give "authorative information on the entire cycle of Catholic interests, action and doctrine; what the Church teaches and has taught; what she is doing and has done for the highest welfare of mankind; her methods, past and present; her struggles, her triumphs, and the achievements of her members, not only for her own immediate benefit, but for the broadening and deepening of true science, literature and art." They announced that "the book would not be exclusively a Church encyclopedia, nor limited to the ecclesiastical science and the teaching of churchmen, but that it should be a record of all that Catholics have done, not only in behalf of charity and morals, but also for the intellectual and artistic development of mankind; that it should record what Catholic artists, educators, poets, scientists and men of action have achieved in their special provinces; that it should contain not only precise statements of what the Church has defined, but also an impartial record of the different views of acknowledged authority on all disputed questions; that the work should be entirely new and not a mere translation or compilation from other encyclopedic sources; that the contributors should be chosen for their special knowledge and skill for presenting the subject, and that they should represent Catholic scholarship in every part of the world. The first volume proves beyond a doubt that the editors have lived up to their promise, and the list of contributors to the first volume shows that the writers have been chosen without respect of location for their special fitness for the respective subjects assigned to them. Each contribution is the work of a scholar. Each is original. Even the

shortest shows the same care as the longest. A striking feature is the bibliography which follows each contribution.

The illustrations are unusually excellent. The whole book is printed on a paper that serves to bring forth the very best results in this regard. On the whole the "Catholic Encyclopedia" is a monumental work. Each volume has a distinct value because it begins to open up a field which is extremely rich and which broadens with the appearance of each successive volume.

We sincerely hope that the work will receive the encouragement which it deserves at once, and that the public will realize the wisdom of subscribing for it immediately.. It should be in the library of every English-speaking priest, of every student, irrespective of creed, of every institution of learning, ecclesiastical or secular, of every State or community. It is simply indispensable.

GUILLAUME I. Roi des Pays-Bas et l'Eglise Catholique en Belgique (1814-1830). Par *Ch. Terlinden, LL. D.* Tome I., La lutte entre l'Eglise et l'Etat (1814-1826), pp. xxi.+526. Tome II., Le Concordat (1826-1830), pp. 470. Bruxelles Librairie, A. Dewitt, 1906.

We have in these two royal octavos—royal no less for their historical merits than for their material construction—the most noteworthy attempt to tell the story of the events and the struggles that led up to the Revolution of 1830 and the severance of the Netherlands into the two independent kingdoms of Belgium and Holland. It is true M. de Gerlache's "Histoire des Pays-Bas" and the introductory materials of Juste, de Bavay, Nothomb, to say nothing of the more general works of Balan, Nuyens and perhaps a few others, and more especially the learned researches of Poullet and Colembrander and most of all of Albers, S. J., have thrown much light on the period in question; but the work here presented is the first attempt to draw forth from the original sources a complete account of the history of Belgian independence. Indeed, a work of this kind has until lately been hardly possible, for it was only very recently that the bringing together in the general archives of the Dutch Government at the Hague of all the documents preserved in the various ministerial departments for the period from 1814 to 1830 has placed within the available control of the scholar the original materials for such a history. Besides these materials the present author had the exceptional advantage of drawing upon the hitherto secret archives of the Secretariat of State and those of the Congregation of Extraordinary Affairs at Rome, while the British Museum furnished him with a number of highly important documents pertaining to religious conditions in the Netherlands. Tributary to

these main channels of supply have been various other sources of more or less original materials, so that the author has been able to bring forward the primal witnesses to attest the deeds and the motives of his country's founders. We say *deeds* and *motives;* for while M. Terlinden's aim is before all else historical—to narrate *deeds,* events—and in the furtherance of this aim he sacrifices not a little of that literary grace to which popular works of history owe so much of their interest, nevertheless he is too thoroughly a historian to pass by the interpretative finality of such widely human events as lead to a revolution that brings about the political independence of a people. And so the motives that brought about that revolution are not left concealed in the chronicle of the events. Religion was one of the main if not quite the primary cause of the Belgian severance in 1830. It was the persecuting policy of William's government that impelled the Catholics of Belgium to ally their forces with the liberalistic party, themselves groaning under the oppressive exactions of the Orange King. Neither party could have secured independence without the other. Together they succeeded under the combining impulse of religion and political liberty. The fact and the urgency of this dual motive are convincingly established by M. Terliden, though it must not be inferred from this that his work is a brief for a partisan cause. In no true sense can the work be called polemical. It is first and last a narrative of historical events—events which themselves bespeak the personal element, the struggles of a sturdy people for their natural rights—the claims of conscience and legitimate freedom from tyrannical oppression.

DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. Edited by *Rev. James Hastings, D. D.* Volume I., royal 8vo., 950 pages, with map, etc. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

"The purpose of this Dictionary is to give an account of everything that relates to Christ—His person, life, work and teaching. It is in a sense complementary to the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' in which, of course, Christ has a great place. But a dictionary of the Bible, being occupied mainly with things biographical, historical, geographical or antiquarian, does not give attention to the things of Christ sufficient for the needs of the preacher, to whom Christ is everything. This is, first of all, a preacher's dictionary. The authors of the articles have been carefully chosen from among those scholars who are, or have been, themselves preachers. And even when the articles have the same titles as articles in the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' they are written by new men and from a new stand-

point. It is thus a work which is quite distinct from and altogether independent of the 'Dictionary of the Bible.'

"It is called a 'Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels' because it includes everything that the Gospels contain, whether directly related to Christ or not. Its range, however, is far greater than that of the Gospels. It seeks to cover all that relates to Christ throughout the Bible and in the life and literature of the world. It will be observed at once that a large number of the titles of the articles are new. Again, there are certain topics which are treated more fully here than in the 'Dictionary of the Bible,' because they have specially to do with Christ. All these articles, moreover, have a range which is greater than the corresponding articles in the 'Dictionary of the Bible' if they occur there. They describe some aspect of Christ's person or work, not only as it is presented in the Bible, but also as it has been brought out in the history of the Church and in Christian experience. The subject is inexhaustible. It has not been exhausted in this work. Perhaps the most that has been done is to show how great Christ is."

This description of the work shows at once that it is very important in conception and execution. Throughout it bears the marks of earnestness and accuracy. We must repeat what we said in reviewing the Bible Dictionary from the same house, and we do so in no fault-finding spirit, but for the sake of accuracy, this is not a Catholic book. As far as we know, and we have glanced over the list of contributors, there is no Catholic among them. We are sorry for this, and we think it is a mistake, but it is the publisher's business. We have Biblical scholars who are unexcelled and who could treat certain subjects as well or better than any one else. And then there is the Catholic interpretation of many texts which cannot be ignored. It is true that in the present work the writers sometimes refer to the Catholic view, and this is a decided advancement. But it is not done always, and it is generally done too briefly.

We repeat that we are not finding fault with the Dictionary, because it does not pretend to be what it is not, and we must take it for what it is. We have here a fund of information carefully collected, attractively and clearly set forth and printed in a manner to attract and hold even the less zealous student.

THE CASUIST. A Collection of Cases in Moral and Pastoral Theology. 8vo., pp. 339. James F. Wagner, New York.

"The present volume, made up chiefly of cases that appeared in *The Homiletic Monthly*, is issued in answer to the request of some

of the subscribers to this magazine who have expressed their desire to possess these cases in such form as to be easily accessible when reference to them is necessitated by the exigencies of daily missionary life.

"The cases are plain and practical, such as come into the sphere of activity of the priest whose duty brings him into intimate relations with souls, either as confessor, or adviser, or friend.

"In fact, many of the cases presented are original, and were sent to the editor for solution by busy or perplexed missionaries. Others, taken from the various periodicals, have been chosen for their practical value, and to such cases the author's name is appended."

This book opens up the question again: Should works on moral theology be published in the vernacular? We think not, because Latin is still taught in our seminaries for good and sufficient reasons, and we presume that all theological students are able to read the language well enough to understand books of moral theology. The information contained in these books ought to be confined to priests or persons preparing for the priesthood. The laity should get their knowledge of moral theology in other ways. We must add, and do so with pleasure, that the book is of real practical value. The cases are well chosen. They fit right into our every-day needs. They answer questions that arise every day and that require special interpretation and application of the law. There is one serious drawback that should be remedied in a future edition: the name of the author is not on the title page. It will not do to say that authorities are quoted at every step. The name of a responsible author would induce us to accept these quotations as correct and would encourage us to follow his conclusions more readily.

MEDITATIONS FOR THE USE OF THE SECULAR CLERGY. From the French of Father Chaignon, S. J. By *Right Rev. L. De Goesbriand, D. D.*, Bishop of Burlington. In two volumes. 8vo., pp. 695 and 512. New revised edition. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

When this book was first published the pious translator spoke of it as follows:

"A book in the English language containing a course of meditations for the use of the secular clergy is very much needed in the United States and elsewhere. The work of which we give a translation was not, however, written by a secular priest; it is the work of a reverend Jesuit Father, who died in 1883 at Angers. But the venerable father had received from God the vocation to devote himself to the sanctification of the secular clergy, with the details of whose life he was perfectly acquainted. Father Chaignon wrote

of himself: 'Through a merciful and providential disposition, for which we shall be forever thankful, God designed to make use of us in a great number of pastoral retreats, during more than thirty years, to remind His ministers of the glorious privileges and the grave obligations of the priest and the pastor.' It has also been written of Father Chaignon: 'Over three hundred retreats preached with admirable success in nearly every diocese of France are an evidence of his particular vocation.' The learned lecturer has reproduced the substance of his conferences in books which are known and admired by all priests. They constitute a remarkable monument of eloquence and piety, which secures to their author a conspicuous place amongst the most eminent masters of the spiritual life. The idea of the dignity and excellence of the priesthood had taken possession of the whole soul of Father Chaignon, and to communicate it strong and luminous to the minds of the clergy he applied all the resources of his talent and the wealth of his learning."

Since these words were written other excellent books of meditation for clergy and laity have appeared, and therefore the same need does not exist now. The excellence of this work has not, however, grown less, nor does it suffer by comparison.

After preliminary chapters on the necessity of meditation and on the different methods, the author treats in the first volume of the sanctification of the priest, and in the second he furnishes meditations for the Sundays and feasts of the year and for the feasts of some saints. Each meditation is arranged simply. First the subject is announced, then the points. After the points have been developed consecutively there is a resumé of them.

AN INDEXED SYNOPSIS OF THE "GRAMMAR OF ASSENT." By *Rev. John J. Toohey, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 220 Longmans, Green & Co., 91 and 93 Fifth avenue, New York; London and Bombay.

"The philosophy of Cardinal Newman is arousing such widespread interest and is assuming such a prominence in the controversial and apologetic literature of the day that there seems to be a call for a work which shall bring the contents of that philosophy within easy reach of inquiring minds and make it possible to pursue with facility a systematic study of it. The present volume is an attempt in this direction as regards that portion of Newman's philosophy which is developed in the 'Grammar of Assent.' And whatever be the individual judgment upon Newman's philosophical system, it is hoped that this synopsis will commend itself to serious students generally as contributing in some way towards an adjustment of the claims of that philosophy upon our acceptance.

"This volume departs considerably from the ordinary plan of a synopsis; by being thrown into the form of an index, it is intended to serve at once as an analytical index to the 'Grammar of Assent,' as a dictionary of Newman's philosophy, as a catalogue of his doctrines and as a summary of his arguments. Moreover, this synopsis has not aimed at presenting a bare outline or skeleton of Newman's thought such as is commonly found in a synopsis or index; it goes much further. As far as is consistent with the scope of the book, Newman has been allowed to speak in his own words, without abridgment; for it was considered that those who should read this synopsis would be much better satisfied if Newman's thought was presented to them in his own language, and with a certain fullness, than if it was unduly compressed or interpreted for them by the words of another."

We imagine that no one will question what the author says about the excellence of Newman's philosophy and the desirability of making it more accessible. Nor will any one be likely to question the means which the author uses to that end. We can assure our readers that the plan of action has been faithfully followed and that the result is admirable.

La Doctrine de la Predestination. Dans l'Eglise Réformée des Pays-Bas depuis l'origine jusq'au Synode National de Dordrecht en 1618 et 1619. Etude Historique par *Théodore Van Oppenraay*. Pp. xiv.+272. Lovanii: Joseph Van Leuthout, 1906.

The monographs written by the candidates for academic honors in the theological faculty of Louvain are magisterial not only in the sense that they worthily represent the dignity and sustain the splendid reputation of that university, but more literally in that they are books which truly *teach*, works that increase, widen and freshen the existing fund of information on their respective subjects. Looking over the long list of these publications—some three score in all and dating back as far as 1841—one is struck by the wide range and interest of the subjects which they cover. Theology—dogmatic and moral—Sacred Scripture, ecclesiastical history, canon law—all the departments of divinities are enriched by these researches. The latest accession to the list, the essay here presented, is obviously one that will not attract the general reader; but the student whose *Fach*—as the Germans call it—lies in the doctrinal history of the Reformation will find this monograph highly instructive and interesting. The author has limited himself to a relatively brief period of time, the first portion of which covers the second half of the sixteenth century, during which portion certain preachers of the new evangel endeavored to introduce the doctrine of condi-

tional predestination into the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. The second portion covers the first eighteen years of the seventeenth century, the period of the Arminian movement in behalf of the same teaching. In following the course of this doctrinal history the author's aim and spirit is in no sense polemical. His interest is exclusively historical and his material is drawn from the original sources—the dogmatic books used by the first and the successive Reformed communities. A glance over the extensive bibliography assures the reader of the painstaking research that has made the work possible and has placed within reach of the student of the characteristic tenets of Calvinism so thorough and reliable a medium of information.

LES ORIGINES DU STYLE GOTHIQUE EN BRABANT. Par *Raymond Lemaire, D. Sc., mor. et hist.* Partie I., L'Architecture Romaine. Vromant et Cie, Bruxelles, 1906, pp. xi.+312. Fourth ed.

The origin and early development of the architectural glories of the thirteenth century are still but imperfectly known, notwithstanding the amount of research they have elicited and the extensive literature they have called forth. Nor will that knowledge become adequate until detailed studies of the individual localities wherein those monuments exist enmass the necessary data. A study of this kind is embodied in the above work. The author has confined his investigations to Brabant, a province whose numerous early and mediæval religious edifices offer abundant material. The field thus restricted would not at first sight seem likely to have more than a local or at the most a professional interest. However, the relation of historical development under which the author has conceived his subject gives to his book a much wider appeal. The universalizing relation here meant is the history of the Roman architecture in general and in Belgium—Brabant—in particular. To each of these introductory viewpoints M. Lemaire has devoted interesting though withal brief chapters. The larger bulk, however, of the present volume consists in the textual description—fully and richly illustrated by photographs, outlines and plans—of the relics of the Roman style existing in Brabant, especially in the neighborhood of Louvain, Brussels and Tirlemont. The foundation is thus laid in the Roman period of the Belgian temples for the subsequent transition to and development of the Gothic style—the style which is to form the main theme of the next installment of the author's work. The present volume, therefore, while wholly introductory to that theme, has its own completeness, due to the singleness of its subject matter—Roman architecture—and should as such have an interest not only

for the professional student of architecture, but likewise for the general reader, especially for one who is preparing to travel in the pertinent region. For the latter the author's luminous descriptions and illustrations will have a unique value.

PROPOSED REPUBLICATION OF THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND, First Bishop of Charleston. Edited under the direction of the *Most Rev. Sebastian G. Messmer*, Archbishop of Milwaukee, with Introduction, Notes and Index by *Rev. J. T. McDermott, D. D.*

From the Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland, Ohio, we receive the announcement that they will, in case sufficient orders are promptly received, republish the collected works of Bishop England. This is an undertaking of vital interest to American Catholics and affords them a rare opportunity to do a service to the cause of Catholic literature and education.

Bishop England's works have a permanent value not only as literature, but as an important and almost the only source for the early history of Catholicism in America. In the present age of criticism and controversy these rare volumes are being sought on account of their inestimable value as a repository of argument and illustration of the important tenets of the Catholic faith, couched in language so apt and expressive as to be valuable for all time both to clergyman and layman. Scholars are just now beginning to appreciate Bishop England as a man of letters.

He possessed one of the most vigorous and versatile intellects that the Church in this country has produced. His writings are veritable storehouses of information on subjects literary, historical and ecclesiastical. As a champion of the faith in the early days he engaged in many notable controversies, and his addresses and arguments in every field of polemics have almost the character of a standard reference work on the subject. The clergy and laity will therefore welcome this work, and it is indeed surprising that it has been allowed to remain inaccessible for so long a time.

MEDULLA FUNDAMENTALIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, quam Seminaristis et Presbyteris Paravit *Gulielmus Stang*, Episcopus Riverormensis, S. Theologiæ Doctor, Ejusque Lovanii Quondam Professor. Editio Altera et Aucta. Neo-Eboraci, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The appearance of a second edition of Bishop Stang's book emphasizes the loss which the Church in this country has suffered in his death. He had a rare combination of talents, and he made every one bring forth fruit a hundredfold. In this little book,

already well known, we have a synopsis which he formerly made for his pupils at Lorain. His motto was briefness and clearness, and he has lived up to it. He was not mistaken when he resolved to make the work accessible to a larger number by publishing it in book form. It will do all that he expected it to do. It will bring the principles of moral theology back to the mind quickly, and it can be kept at hand and carried about much more easily than fuller and larger volumes. It is not necessary to say a word about the manner in which the work is done. Bishop Stang's name is a guarantee of excellence.

BENEDICENDA; or, Rites and Ceremonies of Some of the Principal Functions of the Roman Pontifical and Roman Ritual. By *Rev. A. J. Schulte.* 8vo., cloth, net, $1.50.

A companion volume to Father Schulte's excellent book called "Consecranda." The work of the same skillful hand, guided by the same clear, well-informed, experienced mind, and possessing the same value, not only for Bishops, priests and such clerics as take part in the ceremonies, but also for students in ecclesiastical seminaries who can gain from it at once that clear, intelligent and comprehensive understanding of the blessings of the Church, which comes to most priests only after years of labor and study, and perhaps blundering, and sometimes doesn't come at all. Any one who has used Father Schulte's books in practice knows their true value. We have had that happy experience, and therefore we can recommend them unreservedly.

STUDIES IN IRISH HISTORY. 1603-1649. Being a course of lectures delivered before the Irish Literary Society of London. Edited by R. Barry O'Brien. Second series. 12mo., pp. 324. Brown & Nolan, Ltd., Dublin, Belfast and Cork.

The subjects of the lectures are: "The Plantation of Ulster," by Rev. S. A. Cox, M. A.; "Strafford"—Part I., "The Graces;" Part II., "The Eve of 1641"—by Philip Wilson, M. A.; "1641," by Arthur Houston, K. C., LL. D., and "The Confederation of Kilkenny," by Dr. Donelan, M. Ch., M. B.

The subjects have strong historic interest and are treated at length by gentlemen of national reputation in an able and interesting manner. The value of the lectures is much enhanced by notes and bibliographies.

70765

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM